Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-87-189 30 September 1987

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

PRAVDA Views U.S. Stance on ABM Treaty *[Viktorov, 29 Sep]* 1
U.S. Pressures on INF Accord Examined *[PRAVDA 26 Sep]* 3

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Gribkov Discusses 'Defensive' Doctrine *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA]* 5
Yakovlev Addresses Foreign Sports Officials *[SOVETSKIY SPORT 26 Sep]* 8
CEMA Talks Open in Addis Ababa 29 Sep 9

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Pyadyshev Speaks to Reporters 29 Sep 10
Reviews Shevardnadze's Visit 10
'Explosive' Situation in Gulf 10
PRC Political Consultations 10
Expresses Optimism for Accord *[AFP]* 10
Welcomes French Arms Stand 10
Petrovskiy, UN Delegation on Global Security 11
International Democratic Union Confers *[Borisov, Klyuyev in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 26 Sep]* 12
North Atlantic Assembly Meets in Oslo *[Kuznetsov in PRAVDA 27 Sep]* 13
Soviet Delegates Address ILO Conference *[TRUD 23 Sep]* 13
Pyongyang Anti-Imperialist Conference Opens *[Lukashin in IZVESTIYA 26 Sep]* 14
Nishanov Receives Visiting Statesmen 25 Sep *[IZVESTIYA 26 Sep]* 14

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

U.S. Policy in Gulf Examined, Criticized *[PRAVDA 27 Sep]* 15
Commentary Views Weinberger Visit to Gulf 15
Redman Cited on Shevardnadze UNGA Speech *[IZVESTIYA 26 Sep]* 16
Visa Denied to Soviet Conference Attendee 16
Peace Activists 'Abandon' Stereotypes of USSR 17
IZVESTIYA Carries Interview With Cuomo *[24 Sep]* 17
Canadian Parliamentarians Visit Minsk 18

China

PRAVDA Reports Zhao Ziyang NBC Interview *[29 Sep]* 19
Ties with PRC, Cambodia Question Assessed *[Alekseyev]* 19
Beijing Citizens 'Building Socialism' 20

Northeast Asia

Japan Plans To Send Escort Ship to Gulf *[Anichkin]* 20
Moscow on COCOM Rules Hurting Japanese Trade *[Patapov]* 21
KYODO Correspondent on Gorbachev Article 21
JSP EC Delegation Visits USSR 19-25 Sep 21
JSP Delegation Meets Kim Il-song 28 Sep *[PRAVDA 29 Sep]* 21
U.S. 'Violation' of DPRK Airspace Noted 22
Orlov, Delegation Continue Mongolian Visit *[IZVESTIYA 16 Sep]* 22
Dolgikh Activities in Ulaanbaatar 25 Sep *[PRAVDA 26 Sep]* 22

Near East & South Asia

Further Developments in Gulf Situation *[IZVESTIYA 29 Sep]* 22
Belyayev Views Gulf After 'Iran Ajr' *[Belyayev in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 30 Sep]* 23
Deputy Foreign Minister Meets Iranian Envoy *[Tehran]* 24
Petrovskiy Meets Lebanon's Al-Jumayyil in NY 24
Lizichev, Delegation Arrive in YAR 25 Sep *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Sep]* 24
CPSU Group Leaves for Damascus Symposium *[PRAVDA 28 Sep]* 24

East Europe

Jaruzelski Meets With Vice President Bush *[IZVESTIYA 29 Sep]* 24
Bulgarian Visitors Meet With Nishanov *[IZVESTIYA 27 Sep]* 25
Bulgarian Leaders' Thanks for Greetings *[PRAVDA 27 Sep]* 25

West Europe

Gorbachev Addresses French Delegation 25
Discussion With Participants *[PRAVDA 30 Sep]* 31
AFP Reports Meeting 39
Dobrynin Receives French Parliamentarian 40
Voss Receives Spanish Communist Delegation 40

Latin America

Further on Shevardnadze Visit to Brazil 40
Troops To Leave DRA 'Soon' *[Rio de Janeiro]* 40
Continues Talks With Sodre 40
Sodre Previews Visit *[IZVESTIYA 26 Sep]* 41
Brazil's President Sarney Greeted on Jubilee *[IZVESTIYA 29 Sep]* 42
PCC Central Committee Plenum Begins 26 Sep 42
Focus on Social Issues *[PRAVDA 27 Sep]* 42
Reviews Criminal Code *[PRAVDA 28 Sep]* 43
Knyazyuk, Delegation Leave for Caracas *[PRAVDA 27 Sep]* 43
Delegation Returns From Jamaica Conference *[PRAVDA 27 Sep]* 43

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Gorbachev Leaves Moscow For Murmansk 44
Arrival in Murmansk 44
Murmansk History Reviewed 44
Leaders Address Cadre Training Participants *[PRAVDA 26 Sep]* 44
Zaykov Attends Machine Builders' Day Meeting *[PRAVDA 26 Sep]* 45
Lukyanov Attends 25 Sep Moscow Concert *[PRAVDA 26 Sep]* 45
Sakharov Article 'Hopeful' About Reform *[AFP]* 45
Six Thousand Jews Emigrate in 8 Months *[AFP]* 46
Georgian Protests Delay Railroad Project *[AFP]* 46
Existence of 'Forbidden Zones' Scored *[IZVESTIYA 23 Sep]* 47
Party Admissions Procedure Criticized *[Bondarenko in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 23 Sep]* 48
People's Control Chief on Restructuring *[PRAVDA 24 Sep]* 50

Economic

Resolution on Price Restructuring
[SOBRANIYE POSTANOVLENIY PRAVITELSTVA SSSR, OTDEL No 36, 1987] 54

Agricultural

Kazakhstan Grain Shipped for Drying *[IZVESTIYA 26 Sep]* 60
Dhzambul Oblast Grain Sale Figures Reported *[PRAVDA 27 Sep]* 60
Central Committee Resolution on Food Program *[PRAVDA 25 Sep]* 61
Media Report 27-28 Sep Developments 63

Scientific

'Cosmos-1887' Scientific Satellite Launched 64
Mir Complex Flight Continues 'Normally' 64
BRIEFS 65
Leningrad-Antarctic Air Bridge 65

Military

USSR 'Prepared To Publish' Defense Figures *[Tsoppi in MOSCOW NEWS 6 Sep]* 65

PRAVDA Views U.S. Stance on ABM Treaty

PM291227 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Sep 87 First Edition p 4

[Article by V. Viktorov: "Major Question of World Politics; ABM Treaty and Universal Security"]

[Text] The Soviet-U.S. agreement in principle on concluding a treaty on medium-range and shorter-range missiles has been welcomed with satisfaction everywhere in the world as an important and promising event.

Calling this agreement "a step toward a nuclear-free world," the international public believes that it could pave the way to radical reductions of strategic offensive armaments. That is also the USSR's viewpoint.

In his article "Reality and Guarantees of a Secure World," M.S. Gorbachev notes: "A treaty on medium-range and operational-tactical missiles would be a good prelude to headway at the talks on major — 50 percent — reductions in strategic offensive armaments under the conditions of the strict observance of the ABM Treaty."

This statement by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary clearly defines the role which must be played by the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems between the USSR and the United States, which joined the ranks of acting international agreements 15 years ago—3 October 1972.

From the first day of its existence this treaty has been associated in the most direct fashion with the task of curbing the strategic offensive arms race.

The ABM Treaty allowed the two states not only to avoid a dangerous and expensive rivalry in the field of creating ABM defense systems but also significantly weakened incentives to build up strategic offensive weapons with a view to overcoming the other side's ABM defense. The Interim Agreement on Certain Measures With Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms was signed with the ABM Treaty and entered into force at the same time. The alternative to concluding these Soviet-U.S. agreements would essentially have been a race growing from one year to the next in the deployment of expensive ABM systems by both sides, accompanied by just as intensive a buildup of strategic offensive armaments.

From the outset the Soviet Union has advocated the consistent implementation of all provisions of the accords which have been reached. The USSR Government statement made when the treaty was being submitted for ratification stressed: "The treaty and the interim agreement do not need any far-fetched interpretations and terms. It is important that the provisions of the agreements concluded should be steadily implemented in letter and spirit."

A totally different atmosphere, complex and political, formed around the ABM Treaty in the United States. From the first days of the agreement loud figures with influence in military-political circles like General Keegan, former leader of U.S. Air Force Intelligence, began to raise their heads and argue that the ABM system was "technically feasible and strategically justified," and should therefore be deployed. The members of the "Committee on the Present Danger" — an extreme conservative organization created in 1976 whose participants subsequently made a considerable contribution to forming R. Reagan's political platform — set about promoting this idea with particular zeal. As always in such militarist ventures, E. Teller, the "father" of the U.S. hydrogen bomb, joined them, asserting that new achievements in physics can ensure an impressive quantity of energy necessary for a defensive system against ballistic missiles.

Thus, the ground was gradually prepared in the United States for the "Star Wars" concept which President Reagan put into political orbit in his 23 March 1983 nationally televised speech. The "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) program he proclaimed was a negation of the very idea of the ABM Treaty inasmuch as the aim of this program is to create an ABM system with space-based elements.

Having set as its task the creation of a "space shield" against ballistic missiles, the U.S. Administration, not even thinking of abandoning strategic offensive armaments, was obviously counting on retaining the possibility of delivering a first disarming nuclear strike. Also considered in the SDI plans was the intention to draw the Soviet Union into a ruinous arms race on various fronts, to force it to constantly restructure its armed forces and spend funds on objects which cannot effectively ensure the interests of its security. That is precisely what is envisioned in the latest U.S. doctrine of so-called "strategic competition," within which SDI occupies an important place.

It is not surprising that the initiators of SDI have mounted a massive attack on the ABM Treaty, a defensive barrier in the path of their plans. The lawyers defending the Pentagon's interests have come out with a so-called "expanded" interpretation of the ABM Treaty, according to which any devices necessary for space ABM defense can be created and tested. Early this year the leaders of the U.S. military department mounted a noisy campaign for the speediest gradual deployment of the "first section" of ABM defense, which would be a direct violation of the ABM Treaty.

To justify its intention to create a wide-scale ABM defense, official U.S. policy claims that this "defensive" system will make the world situation more stable and that the USSR and the United States should agree on a "regulated" transition to "deterrence with the emphasis

on defense." In this connection the need arises to approach "in a new way" the question of the relationship between offensive and defensive strategic forces.

It is not hard to discern behind all these "defense" and "defensive" arguments the desire to revise the ABM Treaty and open up the opportunity for creating and deploying a space-based antimissile defense. The treaty itself, however, gives an absolutely clear reply to the question of how defensive and offensive forces are dependent on each other: "Effective measures to limit anti-ballistic missile systems would be a substantial factor in curbing the race in strategic offensive arms and would lead to a decrease in the risk of an outbreak of war involving nuclear weapons." It follows from this that a free hand in developing ABM systems would have the opposite effect. A convincing illustration of this is the experience of the recent past. In the sixties, the United States' efforts and plans for creating an ABM defense immediately activated experiments for overcoming this defense. MIRVed missiles were created, which by universal recognition destabilized the strategic situation, although the United States did not in fact set about creating an ABM system.

But what if such systems on both sides had been deployed in accordance with the concept of "deterrence with emphasis on defense?" There is no doubt this would have intensified mutual distrust and suspicion. New offensive weapons including "space-earth" armaments would have appeared.

The U.S. attempts to cancel the clause on the unlimited operation of this agreement attest most eloquently to the desire to continue their course toward breaking the ABM Treaty. At the Geneva talks the U.S. delegation proposed limiting the time of nonwithdrawal from the treaty to 7 years and giving each side the right to deploy a space ABM echelon after 1994. This deadline evidently fits into the SDI's creators' intentions to embark on the implementation of wide-scale ABM plans.

If you analyze comprehensively the present state of affairs regarding the ABM Treaty, you cannot fail to notice that those circles which have directed their efforts toward undermining this agreement and implementing the SDI program have so far failed to achieve the successes on which they were counting. Their activeness is meeting with significant resistance even within the United States itself.

In that country there are few people who now believe in the possibility of creating a "space shield" which is impenetrable to ballistic missiles. In its report published in April this year the prestigious American Physics Society exposed the Administration's optimistic reports regarding achievements in the field of "exotic" ABM systems, markedly strengthening the position of critics of the SDI program. The administration has not succeeded in gaining support for its plans for the early gradual deployment of a wide-scale space ABM defense.

A palpable blow to the administration's campaign in favor of an "expanded" interpretation of the ABM Treaty was delivered by S. Nunn, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, in a report published in May this year. On the basis of extensive factual material drawn from many sources, including secret reports by the U.S. delegation at the SALT I talks, the report confirms the well-founded nature of only the "narrow" (that is traditional) interpretation of the treaty. A majority in the U.S. Senate recently voted for a resolution demanding that the administration obtain Congress' agreement before it carries out SDI tests on the basis of its new interpretation of the ABM Treaty.

However that may be, despite opposition to their plans, the supporters of SDI are not laying down their arms. It was reported in Washington recently that the Pentagon has approved a program of "demonstration tests" on elements of the first echelon of a space ABM system.

The task of preserving and strengthening the ABM Treaty remains now one of the most urgent in world politics. Proceeding from this premise, the Soviet side in Geneva has submitted a draft agreement on some measures to consolidate the regime of the ABM Treaty and prevent an arms race in space. A number of proposals on this question were tabled by the Soviet side at the talks in Washington. Their main point is to agree on the nonuse of the right of withdrawal from the treaty for at least 10 years, while strictly observing its obligations. It is envisioned that the sides should continue to observe the treaty even when the 10-year period expires, taking into account the unlimited nature of the agreement. The Soviet Union has expressed itself in favor of ensuring the elimination of any uncertainties in the matter of the strict fulfillment of the treaty's clauses by having specialists from the two countries discuss and define a list of devices whose placement in space would be forbidden. The specifications and dimensions of these devices have even been given.

So far no reply to this initiative has been received from the U.S. side, just as there has been no reply to the Soviet proposal for a meeting between the two countries' defense ministers during the latest session of the Standing Consultative Commission, created by the ABM Treaty to discuss mutual claims concerning violations of this agreement. Incidentally, a convincing refutation of the U.S. accusations that the Krasnoyarsk radar station was a violation of the agreement was the recent invitation of representatives of U.S. Congress to the station: After all, if this radar station had been erected counter to the terms of the ABM Treaty, what point would there have been in the Soviet Union inviting foreign observers to it?

The formerly concluded Soviet-U.S. agreements on nuclear armaments are the product of a conscious choice made in favor of restraint and self-limitation in the most sensitive sphere of mutual relations between the USSR

and the United States. These agreements, and primarily the ABM Treaty, make up the foundation on which a future system of international security can be built.

U.S. Pressures on INF Accord Examined

PM291145 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Sep 87 Second Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Gan dispatch: "Not Just Roses Ahead; Washington and Prospects for a Medium-Range Missiles Agreement"]

[Text] Washington, 25 Sep—For obvious reasons, good news is announced to Americans exclusively by the White House. This "golden rule" was observed all the more so last week, when the talks between Soviet Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz ended in Washington. The smiling President made a personal appearance before journalists crowding the White House press room and reported that the two countries had agreed to sign an agreement limiting medium-range and operational-tactical missiles. "Considerable progress has been achieved," he said, and the quiet hall erupted in a volley of questions.

Questions, questions... There are many questions. But from my chats with colleagues, from the stream of statements and press commentators, I nonetheless feel that the main impression is one of optimism and positive sentiments. Few would exaggerate the importance of a future agreement for ridding the world of the danger of a nuclear catastrophe, for it is clear that it concerns just a small proportion of the deadly arsenals. Its essence, of course — and this is widely recognized — lies elsewhere. For the first time since the start of the nuclear era the USSR and the United States have firmly and definitely agreed to actually eliminate two classes of nuclear arms straightaway. The importance of this step is hard to overestimate, if only because it could mark the start of the reversal of the arms race and pave the way to new agreements and to an overall improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations. One cannot fail to agree with the remark made by *Time* magazine, which called the agreement on medium-range and operational-tactical missiles a "touchstone" which would show whether the Soviet Union and the United States would be able to display the political will to end the arms race.

Among the questions which have been and are being asked in the White House press room, one is asked particularly often: Why was the current improvement not brought about earlier, in the previous years of the Reagan administration? What has changed now? After all, power is still in the hands of the same government whose knee-jerk anticommunism and anti-Sovietism has permeated its policy — a government which refused to accept even a hint of detente in relations with the USSR.

Naturally, there is no question of the White House's ideological views having changed. Indeed, this was made clear for the umpteenth time in the President's speech at the present UN General Assembly session. "Although the President soft-pedaled his usual anticommunist rhetoric, this by no means indicates that he has gone soft on communism. It is just a signal that he is now ready to do business with the Soviet Union as a legitimate power rivaling the United States," *The Washington Post* observer L. Cannon noted.

It can be assumed that if the qualitative transformation in Washington's approach to relations with the USSR noted by the journalists has indeed come about, it has done so for objective reasons. "Browbeaten" public support for abrupt militarization and giant leaps in the military budget has started to wane — according to a recent Gallup poll, 44 percent of Americans consider Pentagon spending too high, whereas only 14 percent hold the opposite view. The whipping up of the feeling of a looming confrontation with the Soviet Union is more and more in conflict with the people's sentiments. There are more and more persistent demands in the country for real arms control steps. "To the amazement of all, not least the administration itself, an arms control treaty is now needed for the country's economic health and the political survival of the Republican Party," *Nation* magazine noted in a recent issue.

I think that many people share that point of view. Professor N. Birnbaum of Georgetown University, a well-known political scientist, told me the following: "Politically R. Reagan and the Republicans need an agreement to strengthen the continued weakening of their positions domestically. One gets the impression that more moderate Republicans recognize the need for flexibility in light of their election defeat last year, the bad taste left by the 'Irangate' scandal, and the uncertain economic situation."

Regarding next year's presidential elections, they do not want to allow the Democrats to accuse the Republican Party of having done nothing on arms control. These are domestic factors. On the other hand, they are, of course, frightened by the attitude of the West Europeans, who — the polls show — believe that the current Soviet leadership is showing greater activeness than the U.S. leadership in seeking agreements. F. Griyer [name as published], a consultant to the Democratic Party, also agrees, admitting: "The agreement clears away one of people's main worries about the Republican Party — that it cannot be trusted on arms control. It removes an issue from which the Democrats had benefited."

It would seem that if this is so the Democrats — who control Congress — would be unhappy and annoyed about the agreement. But no, the situation is not that straightforward. Secretary of State G. Shultz, who set off for Capitol Hill literally a few hours after the White House announcement that agreement had been reached, saw for himself that the reaction in Congress was generally positive. Most of the key Senate members — the ratification of treaties is the prerogative of the upper

house of Congress — welcomed the Soviet-U.S. agreement, Republicans and Democrats alike. True, some of the latter made certain reservations, but nobody categorically opposed ratification of the future treaty. On the contrary, there was optimism and hope for a further agreement. C. Pell, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said: "The ultimate value of an agreement on medium-range missiles will depend on whether it leads to subsequent accords on strategic arms and nuclear tests."

In short, at the present stage the positions of the administration and the Democrats on the specific question of a medium-range and operational-tactical missiles agreement are close, although, of course, the sides' motives hardly coincide. F. Martin [initial as published], campaign manager for Democratic presidential hopeful Senator A. Gore, said, for instance: "We are in favor of the agreement. We congratulate the President. But I can see no changes at the political level. After long years of missed opportunities the Republicans have finally accepted their political opponents' argument that arms control is important."

Are there grounds for this confidence, so much so that an NBC TV commentator said "Friday 18 September 1987 could be the day that the unchecked nuclear arms race started going into reverse"? Yes and no. However paradoxical it might seem, the main and most strident opposition to the agreement is to be found within the ranks of the President's own party. It is enough to note that the four official or potential Republican presidential hopefuls sharply denounced the agreement. These were Congressman J. Kemp, former secretary of state A. Haig, former governor P. Du Pont, and TV preacher P. Robertson.

Many other right wing Republicans, traditionally considered allies of the Reagan administration, will side with them. That is, those who, as *The Christian Science Monitor* put it, "want to maintain the military, economic, and technological pressure on the Soviets," or want to "delay any agreement which would give the Soviet Union a breathing space."

Lacking the political boldness to challenge the White House directly, they have directed a barrage of attacks against the State Department. Their "arguments" are as old as they are false. They are scared about Europe being "decoupled" from the United States in the face of "overwhelming Soviet superiority in conventional arms." They link the question of medium-range missiles either with battlefield nuclear weapons, chemical weapons, or regional conflicts. Naturally, they carefully fail to acknowledge the Soviet Union's stated willingness to discuss the specifics of all three issues.

It can be stated with no risk of error that the "observers" who are already trying to correct the agreement are ensconced in... the administration itself. There have already been statements in the press by anonymous Pentagon and CIA spokesmen stressing the "premature nature" of an agreement on this basis and noting that no verification [proverka] measures have allegedly been worked out yet. Some people are "waking up" to the "likelihood" that the SDI program will be sacrificed at the talks and that there will be "dangerous concessions" on strategic arms. "U.S. experts are afraid that the optimism may be going too far," *The Washington Times* stated.

What is behind all this? One could cite a whole string of motives uniting the opponents of the agreement. I think, however, that the incipient undermining of the future agreement is dictated by one common fear — that its signing by a "conservative administration" will not only pave the way to further accords but will increase the opposition to the planned increases in the Pentagon budget. This is how J. Kemp, the favorite of right-wing radicals, formulated the idea: "I see a genuine danger in moral disarmament. If we sign an agreement on medium-range missiles, then this step might cause tension in NATO, increase the pressure to rid Europe of nuclear weapons, and make it harder to win public support for modernizing our armed forces and creating SDI."

In other words, it is obvious that the announced Soviet-U.S. agreement concerns the interests of powerful U.S. forces — first and foremost, the entire military-industrial complex — who are gambling on tension and militarism.

The picture is thus somewhat confused. It is already possible to foresee considerable difficulties on the road to the agreement on medium-range and operational-tactical missiles. The "antidetente lobbyists" will not give up their positions without furious opposition. The situation is further complicated by the increasing momentum of the election campaign, during which, as has repeatedly been the case in the past, political demagoguery and narrow interests eclipse genuine national and human interests. Incidentally, in order to ratify the treaty the support of two-thirds of the senators (67 out of 100) is needed, whereas 34 votes will correspondingly be sufficient to ensure its failure. According to White House calculations, between 20 and 28 senators are currently planning to vote "against."

There are too many unknowns in the growing battle over medium-range missiles to predict its outcome with any certainty. One thing is clear: The United States is at a crossroads where it has to decide whether to add yet another "brick" to the existing edifice on which a future system of universal security could be based. There is a unique opportunity to achieve this goal. Missing it would mean failing to do our duty to history.

Gribkov Discusses 'Defensive' Doctrine

PM291731 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA

[Interview with Army General A.I. Gribkov, chief of staff of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces, by own correspondent Lieutenant Colonel V. Kosarev: "Doctrine of Maintaining Peace;" date and place unspecified; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] The document "On the Military Doctrine of the Warsaw Treaty States" adopted at the May Political Consultative Committee Conference generated a tremendous response in our country and abroad. Describing it as an example of new political thinking and a new approach to the questions of war and peace, many *Krasnaya Zvezda* readers have asked how certain provisions of the military doctrine are influencing military building in the socialist community countries and how troop training is being implemented in prmilitary doctrine?

[Gribkov] The Warsaw Pact states have never made any secret of their intentions in the military sphere. These, for instance, were openly stated in our alliance's very first document—the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Aid. Thus, Article 5 states the contracting parties will take agreed measures "necessary for strengthening their defense capability in order to protect their peoples' peaceful labor, guarantee the inviolability of their borders and territories, and defend against possible aggression."

In recent years the fraternal countries have comprehensively developed this provision. They have repeatedly stressed their military doctrines are profoundly defensive in nature and have trained their armed forces to repulse outside aggression. Nothing in the history of the Warsaw Pact would attest to an intention to attack anyone or to create the potential for a nuclear first strike (or a non-nuclear first strike, either). The Soviet Union and the other socialist community states are doing everything to ensure that the planet's peaceful future is reliably guaranteed. They consistently assert new approaches to the age-old questions of war and peace and persistently strive to create a nuclear-free, nonviolent world.

The adoption by the Political Consultative Committee of the document on the Warsaw Pact's military doctrine and its publication represented an very important and timely step in this direction. The doctrine provides a clear answer to these questions: how to safeguard security in the nuclear and space age, and how to avert the threat of mankind being utterly immolated in the caldera of the nuclear volcano. There is one way to do this: rule out force and the threat of its use from interstate relations and resolve all disputes by political means. The socialist states have proposed a number of specific measures which, if implemented, would lead to substantial armed forces and arms reductions, a reduction in the threat of war, and a strengthening of confidence.

Speaking of confidence, I mean confidence in the military sphere, an exceptionally sensitive source of mutual concern and suspicion among states. This source cannot be closed off unless a proper understanding is reached of the sides' aims and intentions in the military realm as embodied in their military doctrines. This guided the Warsaw Pact states in announcing their military doctrine.

The fraternal countries have made it possible for the entire world to see their strictly defensive nature and aim of preventing war—both nuclear and conventional. They have invited the NATO states to compare their military doctrines, to analyze their nature, and to jointly examine the direction of their future evolution. The socialist countries are not trying to derive any political or other dividends. They reckon in the course of the comparison of the doctrines, it will be possible to remove the mutual suspicion and distrust built up over the years, to achieve a better understanding of each other's intentions, and to safeguard the defensive principles of the military concepts and doctrines of the military blocs and their members.

[Kosarev] Alleging the Warsaw Pact military doctrine contains nothing new, Western propaganda makes every effort to besmirch the intentions, tasks, and goals of our defensive alliance and continues to accuse it of aggression. Yet the content and aggressive thrust of the NATO military doctrine is painstakingly hushed up...

[Gribkov] It is probably not quite accurate to say it is hushed up. It would be more correct to note statements about the doctrines are accompanied by diametrically opposed conclusions and, moreover, actions. Take, for instance, the NATO leadership's repeated statements about the bloc's defensive nature. They are essentially a beautiful and clearly inappropriate cover for the whole series of aggressive provisions contained in the NATO military doctrine and, in particular, its key element—the "flexible response" strategy. Unlike the Warsaw Pact military doctrine aimed at preventing war, it directly envisages the possibility of waging various wars—nuclear and conventional, local and global. In permitting such a possibility, the NATO leadership makes no secret of whom it plans to use the weapons against. In talking about the "need to defend the West from the threat from the East" the NATO leadership is clearly thinking of the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact states.

Nor can one fail to state that NATO has developed the concept known as "Follow-on Forces Attack." It is aimed at depriving the Warsaw Pact of the ability to repulse aggression. It is entirely based on calculated surprise, which cannot be achieved without a first strike. This inevitably presupposes the creation of a first-strike potential—of which NATO already has many elements. The development of the others is being expedited. All this is bound up with the simultaneous intensification of NATO troop training for resolute offensive operations

against the Warsaw Pact armies—proof of which can be seen in all NATO exercises, including the traditional "Autumn Forge" maneuvers held during the fall.

We should not talk of NATO keeping quiet about its own military doctrine. Rather, we should talk about how the West keeps quiet about the Warsaw Pact military doctrine. This is an actual fact directly linked with paradoxical situations. Even those whose job is to know our military doctrine—senior NATO officers, for instance—are virtually uninformed about its content. This is the reason for the sundry fabrications about our military doctrine current in the West. One of these is the allegation about the existence of some Soviet "mobile operations groups" ["operativnyye manevrennyye gruppy"], which allegedly attests to the Warsaw Pact's aggressiveness. No such formations exist in the Soviet Armed Forces. Operations groups were set up during the Great Patriotic War from headquarters units and formations to resolve the specific tasks of routing the fascist invaders. Their appearance was conditioned by a whole series of factors no longer important today. It is entirely logical to assume, if faced with the need to repulse outside aggression, the Soviet Armed Forces and the fraternal countries' armies would use different forms.

[Kosarev] What can you say about the Warsaw Pact's military organization system? Many readers would like to know how sophisticated it is. In this area are we not behind the United States and NATO, whose leaders are constantly seeking ways of strengthening NATO? What currently commands the attention of the joint and national commands of the Warsaw Pact Armed Forces?

[Gribkov] It is quite understandable that *Krasnaya Zvezda* should be interested in this. The radio, television, and newspapers—including yours—devote considerable space to reports about U.S. and NATO military preparations and commentaries on this topic. Unfortunately, considerably less is written about the Warsaw Pact's activity in strengthening the fraternal countries' collective defense capability or about the tasks being resolved by its military organs and the Joint Armed Forces.

These tasks stem from the doctrinal provision that the allied states' armed forces maintain a level of combat readiness sufficient to prevent them from being taken by surprise; if they are attacked, they will crushingly rebuff the aggressor. This system of military organization currently in effect reliably ensures the complete resolution of these tasks. Not a single superfluous component exists in this system. Our alliance's military organs—the Defense Ministers' Committee, the Joint Command, the Military Council, the Joint Armed Forces Headquarters, and national defense ministries—do everything to maintain the fraternal countries' armed forces at a level of combat readiness which would allow them to repulse any outside attack against any socialist community state. I stress that their activity is of a retaliatory and enforced nature. It is far removed from taking the allied states' armed forces and arms beyond the bounds of what is necessary for defense and for rebuffing a potential aggression.

The Warsaw Pact's military leadership focuses on the problems linked with the training for and conduct of defensive operations by the Joint Armed Forces. NATO cannot fail to know this, since exercises by the Warsaw Pact armies—where these questions are researched and developed—are often attended, as envisaged by the Stockholm agreement, by military observers from the NATO countries.

[Kosarev] The socialist states' military doctrine is international in nature. But of the Warsaw Pact countries only the Soviet Union has nuclear weapons. How does this affect the correlation between the national and the international in military doctrine and in military building in the fraternal countries?

[Gribkov] Yes, this is common knowledge: Of the socialist community states only the USSR has nuclear weapons. And they safeguard the security of all the Warsaw Pact members. However, true to its commitment, the Soviet Union will never use nuclear weapons first, and it is wholly supported in this by the other fraternal countries. This provision is enshrined in their military doctrine, and the operational and combat training of the Joint Armed Forces and each allied army is carried out in accordance with it.

At the same time I must stress the Warsaw Pact states have repeatedly made proposals to eliminate nuclear forces in the structure of the armed forces and armaments of the USSR and the United States, and of the Warsaw Pact and NATO. They defend the idea of creating a nuclear-free world by the year 2000, proving the viability of the suggestion through concrete steps. This applies to the Soviet Union's positions and actions at the talks with the United States on the questions of limiting strategic offensive weapons and eliminating medium-range and operational-tactical missiles. The real prospects which recently emerged for agreeing on some of these problems and the conclusion of the Soviet-U.S. agreement on nuclear risk reduction centers cannot fail to arouse satisfaction.

The USSR'S efforts are supported by the other fraternal countriese actively promoting nuclear disarmament and success at the talks underway. The initiatives put forward by the GDR, the CSSR, Romania, and Bulgaria for the creation of nuclear-free zones in Europe—in the Balkans and in Central Europe—as well as the Polish plan for reducing arms and increasing confidence in central Europe are of great importance. The Warsaw Pact states also believe there is now an opportunity to solve the question of substantial reductions in armed forces and conventional arms in Europe, in the way proposed at the Budapest (1986) conference of the

Political Consultative Committee. As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed in his article "The Reality and Guarantees of a Secure World," we are prepared to switch from confidence-building measures in certain realms to a large-scale policy of confidence-building to gradually shape a comprehensive security system. Such a policy, however, must be based on unity between political statements and actual positions.

[Kosarev] The fraternal countries are doing everything to make the level of military-strategic parity as low as possible and to reduce military potentials to the limit of sufficiency for defense, as stated in their military doctrine. The limits of sufficiency for defense and for repulsing possible aggression are limited not by us but by the actions of the United States and NATO. Does this not mean we are taking a passive stance in the face of a military threat?

[Gribkov] Of course not. The Warsaw Pact's military doctrine tasks the member states' armed forces with preventing war. The resolution of this task is inconceivable without a persistent daily struggle to improve combat readiness, tighten up troop command, and ensure the troops' constant ability to put a stop to any outside encroachment on the sovereignty of any fraternal country.

In the event of an attack taking place, the Warsaw Pact countries' armed forces will operate with exceptional resolve. While repulsing the aggression, they will also conduct counteroffensive operations. This does not contravene the demands of the military doctrine, since—as the experience of the Great Patriotic war and local wars shows—such actions are not only possible but necessary within the framework of defensive operations and battles in individual sectors.

All our practical actions correspond to the principle of sufficiency for defense that forms the basis of the program of building the Warsaw Pact Armed Forces.

[Kosarev] Anatoliy Ivanovich, if I understand you correctly, it could be claimed that all the most important provisions of the military-technical side of the Warsaw Pact military doctrine are already embodied in the building and training of the Joint Armed Forces and each allied army...

[Gribkov] Yes, that is so. In the past, too, the Warsaw Pact Armed Forces trained only to repulse aggressors. Now this process has become even more balanced, purposeful, and coordinated. This has a favorable effect on strengthening the defense potential of the fraternal states' alliance.

Take, for instance, the structure of the Warsaw Pact countries' armed forces. It is currently being improved to match as fully as possible the interests of successfully resolving the tasks of defending our community. To that end, old combat equipment and weapons are being modernized, new ones are being created, and military activity is being planned. Other steps—particularly in developing the theory behind the art of war—are being taken to seek out and develop the most effective ways and means of repulsing aggression. In short, everything the fraternal countries consider possible and necessary to do in the military sphere is being done. This work is being conducted on the basis of close cooperation among the allied states in the military sphere.

[Kosarev] Could you dwell on this question in more detail?

[Gribkov] Cooperation among the Warsaw Pact states in the military sphere is multifaceted. One of its main directions is the coordination and agreement of efforts to strengthen the collective defense capability and develop the national armies and the Joint Armed Forces.

Great importance is attached to military-technical cooperation. This cooperation consists of the allied countries working out a unified, coordinated military-technical policy and developing their defense industries. Its basis is the modern military-economic, scientific, and technical potential of the Warsaw Pact states in conjunction with the effective utilization of all the advantages of economic cooperation within the CEMA framework. The allied states carry out reciprocal deliveries of arms and equipment, exchange licenses and technical documentation, and implement long-term programs for the specialization of military production.

In military cooperation, the leading role is played by the joint and national commands. On the basis of their plans, a whole series of measures is being carried out. The ultimate goal is to ensure the high quality of the combat and political training of troops and naval forces and their constant readiness to undertake rapid, effective actions to defend socialist gains in the event of aggression. A main avenue of this cooperation is to define the central tasks of the training and educational process in the allied countries' armed forces, to solve problems with assimilating modern equipment and weaponry and acquiring the means of their successful use in combat, to study and generalize the experience of operational and combat training, and to define its tasks in the forthcoming training period.

Great attention in training troops and naval forces is devoted to the creative use of everything new and advanced accumulated in the fraternal armies in the area of training and educating the personnel and solving the cardinal tasks linked with improving the combat readiness of formations and units. Cooperation is expanding in the areas of training military cadres and military science. An important role is played by cooperation among political organs and party and youth organizations in the fraternal armies on questions of the political education of the personnel based on the resolutions of those countries' communist and workers parties. Cultural and sports ties are developing.

The results of this work are seen with the greatest clarity during joint exercises involving the allied armies and navies. These exercises improve the activity of commanders, staffs, and political organs and enhance the field, air, and naval training of the allied armies' servicemen.

[Kosarev] We are used to articles on joint exercises reporting on how smoothly and accurately servicemen from the fraternal armies operate. Does this mean joint exercises actually fail to reveal problems and shortcomings in troop training?

[Gribkov] On the whole I think such articles reflect reality—the standard of the training of the allied armies' subunits and units is in line with modern demands. There are problems and unresolved questions. That is natural. One cannot fail to note that no directives, orders, or instructions can foresee the whole gamut of situations in which troops and staffs may find themselves during a battle.

During my years of service with the Joint Armed Forces Staff, I have not once encountered a disdainful attitude to training and joint exercises. All generals, officers, and men—the exercise participants—have always prepared and continue to prepare for them responsibly, giving their all. Of course, sometimes one cannot avoid a situation whereby some commanders try to resolve new tasks in old ways, on the basis of once-standard stock responses, simplistically, and by relying on outward appearances rather than real results. This is generally the result of a lack of experience, insufficiently resolute command, and a fear of responsibility—which we are helping to eradicate.

The few short lines about exercises represent great and multifaceted work by servicemen of the Joint Armed Forces and the allied armies, patriot-servicemen and internationalist-servicemen. In conclusion, I want to stress that the Warsaw Pact is an instrument of peace. It has served, and continues to serve, as a reliable shield for socialism and an obstacle in the path of aggression. This is convincingly attested by the Warsaw Pact's military doctrine.

Yakovlev Addresses Foreign Sports Officials

PM291537 Moscow SOVETSKIY SPORT in Russian 26 Sep 87 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Friendly Meeting"]

[Text] On 25 September A. N. Yakovlev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met with the leaders of the sports organizations of socialist and a number of developing countries.

In his speech A. N. Yakovlev noted that our country is going through a profound process of restructuring that is of great humanitarian significance. Physical culture has an important part to play in this renewal.

Having dwelt on specific tasks of the development of physical culture in socialist society, he stressed its increasing significance in strengthening the health of the populace. Certainly it is important to win championships and break records, but the physical education of people remains the chief task.

In the last 2 years the CPSU Central Committee has examined a number of questions concerned with the further development of physical culture and sports in our country. In particular, a very important document was adopted on improving the use of clubs and sports installations. The main thing is to radically restructure the activity of clubs and sports facilities and direct their attention to Soviet people's increased needs. This document is intended to reinforce the party's efforts aimed at fighting for a healthy way of life. Resolute measures are being adopted on increasing production and improving the quality of goods for people's physical culture, sporting, and tourist activities. Some other measures are being elaborated that will enable one to eliminate serious shortcomings in the development of the physical culture movement.

The scientific and technical revolution brings not only benefits but also certain drawbacks. In these conditions physical culture is meant to perform an important social function. It must belong to everyone and become a conscious, daily need of every person.

The steps the party is taking in the sphere of physical culture are reinforced by the restructuring of the management of this important area of work. The main purpose is to direct attention to the development of physical culture at the grassroots level, in the labor collectives and academic establishments, and organize mass physical culture work directly among all strata of the population.

A. N. Yakovlev paid attention to the problems of stepping up the efforts of the socialist countries' sports organizations in establishing lasting world peace, mutual understanding, and good feelings of friendship and comradeship between peoples. The peace-making role of the sports movement is still an effective force. Even in the most difficult years of the Cold War there were meetings involving athletes from different countries. Attempts to disrupt the Olympic movement were not supported by the world public. The experience of the Moscow Olympics is evidence of that.

At the same time, in recent years the international sports movement has been experiencing heavier and heavier pressure on the part of certain circles in the West trying to undermine the principles of amateur sports. The world sporting public is worried about the increasing

commercialization of sports. To combat alien phenomena in sports it is necessary for the socialist and developing countries to join forces.

A. N. Yakovlev stressed the need to further deepen sporting links between socialist countries. Our cooperation affirms and strengthens the humane essence of socialism, its merits and spiritual and moral values. The main task of our sports organizations remains that of instilling socialist patriotism and internationalism in the millions of athletes and fans.

The meeting participants shared their impressions of the conference of the leaders of sports organizations in the socialist countries and a number of developing countries that was held in Sukhumi 21-24 September.

The meeting, which took place in an atmosphere of cordiality and frankness and mutual understanding on all the matters discussed, was addressed by M. V. Gramov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Physical Culture and Sport, and B. Kapitan, chairman of the Polish Main Committee for Physical Culture and Tourism.

CEMA Talks Open in Addis Ababa 29 Sep

LD292208 Moscow TASS in English 1749 GMT 29 Sep 87

[Text] Addis Ababa September 29 TASS—The first session of the Mixed Commission for Cooperation between the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) and the People's Democratic Republic of Ethiopia opened in Addis Ababa today.

The session attended by representatives of the eight countries making up the CMEA will discuss ways for expanding economic ties with ethiopia in industry, agriculture and transport.

Cooperation between socialist countries and revolutionary Ethiopia based on the principles of equality of the partners, and mutual benefit has good traditions, Ladislav Supka (Czechoslovakia), CMEA deputy secretary, told a TASS correspondent.

A series of major projects have either been carried out or are being implemented in ethiopia with their assistance. All these projects are of big importance for the social and economic development of the country.

One of the fine examples of such cooperation is the construction of the Melka-Wakane hydroelectric station where specialists from the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia are working side by side with their Ethiopian colleagues.

The commission set up in compliance with the October 1986 agreement between the CMEA and Ethiopia opens up a new phase in the development of mutual ties, Ladislav Supka emphasized. It will be characterized by intensified multilateral cooperation within the CMEA framework. This will make it possible to help ethiopia effectively in building a material and technical base of socialist society.

Pyadyshev Speaks to Reporters 29 Sep

Reviews Shevardnadze's Visit

LD292238 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1730 GMTx 29 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow, 29 Sep (TASS)—The 10-day stay in the United States of USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze will become an important page in the history of modern diplomacy, Boris Pyadyshev, first deputy head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, said today at the briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists. The important accord in Washington, the Soviet-U.S. agreement on the global elimination of medium-range and operational-tactical missiles, the constructive dialogues in New York with the foreign ministers of more than 50 states and with the representatives of public and business circles from many countries have boosted good will among the world community. This activity provided clear proof fact that the new political thinking is being incorporated into world politics.

The work of the 42d UN General Assembly session has received fresh impetus against the backdrop of the Soviet-U.S. accord and the deep ideas contained in the article by Mikhail Gorabchev entitled "The Reality and the Guarantees of a Secure World," the USSR Foreign Ministry representative stressed.

'Explosive' Situation in Gulf

LD291600 Moscow TASS in English 1545 GMT 29 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow September 29 TASS—With the situation in the Persian Gulf being explosive, attention is being drawn in the Soviet Union to a serious divergence between the diplomatic efforts being undertaken by the United States and the build up of its military activity in the region. This was stated today at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists by Boris Pyadyshev, first deputy head of the Information Directorate of the Foreign Ministry of the USSR.

The U.S. power politics in the Persian Gulf zone so far leads only to a growth of tension, to a heightening of the crisis, this being at variance with the U.S. Administration's statements on its allegiance to political measures.

The idea of using a U.N. force to ensure security in that region meets a favourable response of the international and American public opinion. In the Soviet Union it is noted with satisfaction that the U.N. secretary general is continuing his peace making efforts. They are not over yet. This is only the beginning. And we are ready to promote these efforts in every way. The world community has displayed serious interest in the Soviet proposal that the U... Security Council's military staff committee be used in solving the Persian Gulf problem.

PRC Political Consultations

LD291533 Moscow TASS in English 1520 GMT 29 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow September 29 TASS—"A regular, eleventh, round of Soviet-Chinese political consultations begins in Beijing on October 6", Boris Pyadyshev, first deputy head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, said at a briefing today.

The consultations are conducted by special representatives of the governments of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China: On the Soviet side by Igor Rogachev, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, and on the Chinese side by Qian Qichen, deputy minister of foreign affairs of China.

Expresses Optimism for Accord

AU291528 Paris AFP in English 1520 GMT 29 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow, Sept 29 (AFP)—One quarter of a draft treaty to eliminate U.S. and Soviet medium-range nuclear missiles has been completed, including a timetable for the abolition of the missiles, a Soviet Government spokesman said here Tuesday.

The timetable for the elimination of the missiles with a range of between 500-5,000 kilometres had been a sticking point at the Geneva arms negotiations, along with the problem of verification.

Foreign Ministry spokesman Boris Pyadyshev told a news conference here that four articles out of a total 16 had been agreed by the arms negotiators.

He expressed optimism that the negotiators would "meet the deadline" of having the draft treaty ready for October 22, when U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz is to visit Moscow for two days of talks to prepare a new superpower summit.

Concerning verification, Mr. Pyadyshev said the issue would be dealt with by a special group, and would be formulated in a protocol to the treaty, due to be signed by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan at their meeting scheduled for the autumn.

Mr. Pyadyshev said that there were still difficulties on verification still outstanding, but these were of a technical nature only.

Welcomes French Arms Stand

LD291539 Moscow Tass in English 1427 GMT 29 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow September 29 TASS—A spokesman for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. compared France's reaction to the latest Soviet-American accords with the one that followed the meeting in Reykjavik.

"At first Paris is making negative appraisals. They are eagerly picked up by the press. Then some adjustments are made. And the French appraisal is becoming more constructive and realistic," said Boris Pyadyshev, first deputy head of the Information Directorate of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. He spoke at a press briefing today.

Answering the question about Paris' initial negative appraisal of the accords, he said: "The initial reaction of the prime minister of the country could not but leave us wary."

However, it is the remarks made by President Francois Mitterrand at a Cabinet meeting that are of major importance. The French statesman expressed satisfaction at the fact that an agreement was reached in principle to abolish Soviet and American medium- and shorter-range missiles and stated his support for that agreement, the Foreign Ministry spokesman emphasized.

Petrovskiy, UN Delegation on Global Security
LD292300 Moscow TASS in English 2111 GMT 29 Sep 87

[Text] New York September 29 TASS—TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Chernyshev reports:

Today the delegation of the USSR at the 42nd session of the United Nations General Assembly gave a press conference on various aspects of the concept of forming a comprehensive system of international peace and security, the concept which the Soviet Union together with a number of other socialist countries suggests to the international community.

This concept is aimed at restructuring international relations on a civilized basis both on a global scale and in individual regions of the world, said Vladimir Petrovsky, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR.

Regionally, just as world-wide, we seek to introduce to practice such new rules of community living which would ensure the security of all states and would thereby be an earnest of the security of everyone. This is essentially a question of finding a balance of diverse interests of states and peoples in respective regions to fit it into a broader context of mutual understanding and concerted actions of the United Nations on the basis of the U.N. Charter.

Regional security, just as global one, cannot be limited only to the sphere of military-political relations. It should also organically include economic, ecological and humanitarian aspects and be formed only on the basis of joint actions.

In reference to Europe, socialist countries suggest the concept of a common 'European Home' on the basis of deepening and developing the all-European process in all its aspects. The proposals by the Warsaw Treaty Organization on reducing the armed forces and conventional arms in the region stretching from the Atlantic to the Urals and on comparing the military doctrines of the two military-political blocs are well-known, too.

Of great importance are the European socialist countries initiatives which proceed from the common line, including the 'Jaruzelski plan' on ways to achieve relaxation of tension in the military field, the proposals by the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and Romania on the establishment of nuclear-free and chemical-weapons-free zones.

A broad spectrum of proposals has been put forward by socialist countries in both economic and humanitarian spheres of European politics. The Soviet Union's invitation to hold a conference in Moscow on the entire range of humanitarian issues is awaiting a constructive reply from the West.

The Soviet Union suggests a comprehensive programme for strengthening peace and security for the Asian-Pacific region as well on the basis of recognition of the existing realities there and the need for the development of relations of goodneighborliness and cooperation, including support for national reconciliation proposals and for a political settlement in painful points of the Asian continent.

We hold that the efforts to build a secure world in Europe and Asia could merge into a single Eurasian process laying down the foundations of a comprehensive security system. The Soviet Union is for making all continents zones of peace and cooperation, for delivering them from nuclear weapons and from the burden of the arms race, for eliminating the disgraceful blights of colonialism, be it in the Middle East, in the South of Africa, in Central America, Southeast Asia, in the South Pacific or in the Indian Ocean area.

In short, on any continent, and at any point on the globe the Soviet Union is prepared to promote an improvement of the situation and the establishment of peace and trust between peoples through constructive practical deeds. We are convinced that the United Nations Organization can and must play the central role in the settlement and prevention of regional conflicts, the Soviet representative pointed out.

All U.N. resources under the U.N. Charter should be used to the full. In development of the proposal by the U.N. secretary general on the establishment of a multilateral war risk reduction centre, it would be possible to weigh the advisability of organizing a direct communication line: the United Nations headquarters—the permanent members of the U.N. Security Council—the chairman of the Nonaligned Movement. It would be also worthwhile to think of establishing under U.N. auspices a mechanism for large-scale international monitoring of

compliance of with agreements on reducing international tensions, on limiting arms, and for monitoring the military situation in conflict areas.

It is extremely important that the U.N. Security Council should be able effectively to use its extensive powers. The key to that is in unity of action of its permanent members. It is precisely such unity that made it possible to pass Resolution 598 on settling the Iran-Iraq conflict, and the statement dated September 25 reaffirming the importance to seek its full implementation, and to express full support for the U.N. secretary-general's efforts to attain this goal.

The international community should also ensure the safety of shipping in the Persian Gulf, he emphasized. On a practical plane, it appears, this question could be tackled by the representatives of the permanent members of the U.N. Security Council in the Military Staff Committee with the participation of other states concerned. It must be recalled that under the U.N. Charter the chiefs of general staffs are representatives in the military staff committee. If our partners are ready to conduct work at this level, there will be no lack of cooperation on our part. [passage indistinct]

[TASS International Service in Russian at 1736 GMT on 29 September carries a similar item that adds: "All this creates a real alternative to the massive military presence of non-littoral states in the Persian Gulf, a military presence that serves as a source of increasing danger and increases the unpredictability of the situation.

"In questions of regional security, as in all other routes of progress towards a secure world, one must not permit a pause either on the "nuclear" or "conventional" paths, or proceed along a path of building up armaments even to replace those which are being eliminated by agreements, but, on the contrary, one must broaden reductions, eliminating the existing disproportions in the forces of the sides by making reductions on that side that is ahead, he stated in conclusion. The Soviet Union calls upon all, without delay, to take practical steps to turn any corner of our planet into a safe place for rewarding living."]

International Democratic Union Confers

PM291503 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 26 Sep 87 Second Edition p 3

[Y. Borisov and N. Klyuyev commentary: "West Berlin: High-Level Private Meeting"]

[Text] The third conference of leading politicians from Western Christian Democratic and Conservative parties who are members of the "International Democratic Union" was held in the Reichstag in West Berlin on 24-26 September at the invitation of H. Kohl, FRG Federal chancellor and chairman of the Christian Democratic Union (CDU). The union now incorporates 22 bourgeois parties from Western Europe, North and Central America, Australia, and Asia, APN and TASS correspondents report.

FRG Federal Chancellor H. Kohl, British Prime Minister M. Thatcher, French Prime Minister J. Chirac, Turkish Prime Minister T. Ozal, and many other prominent right-wing party figures currently in power or in opposition took part in the conference's work.

The conference's main task was to discuss central issues of international policy and East-West relations.

FRG Chancellor H. Kohl, chairman of the CDU, was the host. This is the latest violation of the four-power West Berlin agreement, according to which West Berlin is not part of the FRG.

Addressing the conference, H. Kohl welcomed the Soviet-U.S. accord in principle on eliminating medium-range and operational-tactical missiles. This, he said, is a historic step that must be followed by other steps. According to the chancellor, the basis of Bonn's policy in relation to the socialist countries is to firmly consolidate the FRG in NATO and the "European community."

British Prime Minister M. Thatcher cautioned against "too hasty" talks on short-range nuclear weapons in her speech. M. Thatcher, H. Kohl, and French Prime Minister J. Chirac spoke in favor of continued efforts in the disarmament sphere, although they surrounded this with various conditions and provisions.

In their joint statement the conference participants speak in favor of banning chemical and bacteriological weapons throughout the world and of reducing conventional weapons in Europe. They also speak in favor of continued efforts to reduce stockpiles of short-range nuclear weapons as well as political accords on measures to strengthen trust and security in Europe. At the same time they reject the realities now prevailing on the continent as a result of the war and postwar development, and demand the removal of protective border installations on the state border between the GDR and West Berlin.

Before the conservative meeting, the city police force was placed on alert and the leadership of the West Berlin police distributed leaflets among inhabitants of the city whose homes or firms are situated in the immediate vicinity of places to be visited by representatives of the "International Democratic Union."

The authorities requested West Berlin citizens to show understanding and give the police all the help they may need in preventing disturbances: "Be on the alert for

strangers carrying bags or boxes entering your premises or parking vehicles near your homes which could be used for storing and using explosives, weapons, and other suspicious objects."

North Atlantic Assembly Meets in Oslo

PM291144 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Sep 87 Second Edition p 5

[Yuriy Kuznetsov "Commentator's Column": "Despite the Obvious Will"]

[Text] A session of the North Atlantic Assembly has taken place in the Norwegian capital Oslo, with the participation of more than 200 parliamentarians from all the NATO countries. What did this NATO organ submit for discussion first and foremost? Apparently it was "the challenge which arms control poses for the bloc."

On the whole the speeches heard at the session reflected the dominant international assessment of the Soviet-American accord on the elimination of two classes of nuclear weapons as a major step toward greater security for the peoples, including the European peoples. Norwegian Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland stated, for instance, that "we consider this an important circumstance strengthening security and the chances of concluding new arms agreements in future."

However, the tendency to think in terms of confrontation is evidently still very persistent in the NATO leadership. They are not particularly enraptured by the more autonomous position of the Scandinavian partners, who, for instance, do not allow the permanent stationing of nuclear weapons and armed forces of other states on their territory. And now the bloc's most bellicose figures are apparently trying to compensate for the elimination of medium-range and operational-tactical missiles by stepping up efforts in the sphere of "conventional" arms. This applies fully to northern Europe. In this connection remarks were heard at the session about the need urgently to strengthen the "poorly defended northern flank," by moving so-called multinational forces into the region. As *Reuter* reported, the bloc's official circles even stated that "in accordance with NATO plans" subunits of the West German Bundeswehr could come to Norway for the first time since World War II. For many Norwegians this prospect was not only a highly unpleasant reminder of the days of the Hitlerite occupation, but also an attempt once again to reconcile them to plans for the gradual emasculation of the well known principles of Norwegian foreign policy.

At the same time NATO leaders were making another maneuver in the same direction. The Canadian Government has decided to "detach" from NATO a brigade based in Canada but specially trained for operations in Norway in the event of a "crisis situation." The head of the Canadian delegation to the assembly in Oslo, R. Khik [as transliterated], stated without beating about the bush that the "problems of participation" by Canadians "in the defense of Norway" could be solved if that country permitted the stationing of foreign troops on its territory.

As you can see, the NATO leadership is consistently and unswervingly seeking the same goal: Not to lessen, but to strengthen the military confrontation in Europe. And this, in spite of the entirely obvious will of the peoples for peace, regardless of the true imperative of the times—to promote military and political detente and stop the race for lethal arms.

Soviet Delegates Address ILO Conference

PM291551 Moscow TRUD in Russian 23 Sep 87 p 3

[TASS report: "ILO Conference"]

[Text] Geneva, 22 Sep—The fourth European regional conference of the ILO has been going on here over the past week.

As I. I. Gladkiy, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, stressed, the transformations in the USSR are of a revolutionary nature and are a continuation of the cause of the Great October Socialist Revolution whose 70th anniversary is celebrated this year. Our efforts, the USSR Government representative said, are geared to exploiting more effectively the vast potential of socialism for people and in the interests of people. He also noted that Eastern and Western Europe can help one another in the solution of the most pressing aspects of the employment problem by developing broad economic cooperation and there is great scope here for the ILO.

Addressing the conference, AUCCTU Secretary G. I. Yanayev, the delegate of the USSR working people, said that the organization of all-European trade union cooperation is not an easy process. But it is important and essential to embark on it. We favor the development of constructive dialogue in the ILO as well, where there are already many examples of joint action by working people's representatives. From our viewpoint, all-European cooperation within the ILO framework could develop in areas it deals with such as employment, social aspects of disarmament, protection of the natural and working environment, social consequences of the restructuring of the economy and use of new technology, professional training of cadres, working people's involvement in production management, and questions of production democracy. It would be very appropriate to hold within the ILO framework a conference of European trade union centers on questions of trade union rights and freedoms and the role and place of trade unions in contemporary society.

Today, the final day of the forum, the participants approved several documents. International detente, the development of economic cooperation and mutually

advantageous trade, and the use of measures to promote employment, one resolution says, are prerequisites for lasting peace and the solution of social problems in the interests of working people.

Pyongyang Anti-Imperialist Conference Opens

PM291431 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Sep 87 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Lukashin report: "DPRK: Peace and Stability for Asia"]

[Text] Pyongyang—The international conference "For Nuclear Disarmament, Peace, and Anti-Imperialist Solidarity in Asia and the Pacific," convened on the initiative of AAPSO and the Korean Committee for Solidarity with Asian and African Countries, which opened 24 September, is continuing its work here.

This forum, being held in the People's Palace of Culture, is attended by more than 60 delegations from almost 50 countries of the world, including a Soviet delegation headed by V.G. Tolstikov, first deputy chairman of the Soviet Committee for Solidarity with Asian and African Countries.

The conference participants listened with profound attention to the greetings message from Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Korean Workers Party [WPK] Central Committee and DPRK president, which was read by Hwang Chang-yop, secretary of the WPK Central Committee. The conference has convened at a moment when the safeguarding of peace in Asia and the Pacific has become an imperative necessity, the greetings message notes. We highly value the socialist countries' peace proposals aimed at preventing the threat of nuclear catastrophe and ensuring international security, and express ardent support for the peoples' struggle to create nuclear-free zones of peace in different parts of the globe.

Yesterday's session was addressed by AAPSO Secretary General Nuri 'Abd al-Razzaq and representatives of India, Nicaragua, Poland, and a number of other countries. Addressing the conference V. G. Tolstikov, head of the Soviet delegation, emphasized that the Soviet Union actively seeks the termination of the nuclear arms race and the safeguarding of peace and international security on the planet, including in Asia and the Pacific.

The first day of the conference's work demonstrated that the rejection of the U.S. militarist course by Asian and Pacific peoples is becoming increasingly definite. The positive processes, which were boosted by the constructive proposals to transform this region into a zone of peace, good neighborliness, and cooperation put forward by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his speech in Vladivostok and in the interview with Indonesian newspaper *Merdeka* are becoming a powerful force.

Nishanov Receives Visiting Statesmen 25 Sep

PM291349 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Sep 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] R.N. Nishanov, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, received on 25 September a delegation of the Afghan National [Fatherland] Front headed by its Central Council Chairman Abdorrahim Hatef.

On the same day R.N. Nishanov received Juan Emilio Bosch, Dominican Republic statesman and politician.

United States & Canada

U.S. Policy in Gulf Examined, Criticized

PM291543 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Sep 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under the "Hotspots of the Planet" rubric: "Washington Threatens Teheran"]

[Text] New York, 26 Sep—U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger has delivered new threats to Iran. "We are prepared to take similar resolute tough measures in the future," he stated after an Iranian ship, bombarded and captured by the U.S. Navy at the beginning of the week, was blown up and sunk on his instructions. This action, *The New York Times* notes, "is an example of open confrontation with Iran."

The Pentagon chief is carrying out an inspection trip in the course of which he is trying to boost the morale of U.S. servicemen. He announced his intention to award medals "for service in the Persian Gulf." In the words of *The New York Times*, the tour of U.S. Navy ships patrolling the Gulf "is taking place in conditions of strict secrecy."

At the same time President Reagan has once again categorically stated that he will use his right of veto if Congress takes steps to curtail the desires of the White House to build up armed forces in one of the planet's hotspots. As *The New York Times* stresses, "battles over U.S. policy in the region are currently raging on Capitol Hill."

"As yet the administration has been unable to convince either Congress or the American people of the rightness of its stance," Sam Nunn, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee stated. The opinion is being expressed on Capitol Hill that White House policy in the Persian Gulf is leading to a further increase in tension in this region and is likely to involve the United States in large-scale armed conflict.

A number of former U.S. defense secretaries have pointed out the danger of the interventionist policy in the Persian Gulf, which is fraught with unpredictable consequences. They voiced their opinions in an interview with the Cox information service on the eve of a representative conference opening in Atlanta (Georgia), organized by the Southern International Research Center.

"The Reagan administration is adopting a frankly confrontational position in the Persian Gulf and is asking for trouble," Clark Clifford, defense secretary in the Johnson administration, stated. He called for the withdrawal of the U.S. Navy from the region. Harold Brown, defense secretary in the Carter administration, also voiced serious alarm at the possibility of the exacerbation of confrontation in the Persian Gulf. "There is now a much greater likelihood than 3 or 4 months ago that the United States will get involved in a war in the region," he noted.

Elliot Richardson (Nixon administration) thinks that Washington should not take unilateral measures to reregister Kuwaiti oil tankers but should support the idea of such an operation under UN auspices. James Schlesinger (Nixon and Ford administrations) in turn drew attention to the USSR's sober position regarding the situation in the Persian Gulf. Moscow understands, he pointed out, that the key to resolving the problem of the region "lies in the sphere of diplomacy and not in armed confrontation." "The Soviet Union is acting coolly and reasonably," the former U.S. defense secretary pointed out.

Commentary Views Weinberger Visit to Gulf

NC300836 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1630 GMT 29 Sep 87

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] U.S. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger has ended his visit to the Persian Gulf, where he met with a number of Arab leaders and inspected some warships of the immense U.S. armada stationed in the area. Before discussing the objectives of the Pentagon head's visit, we must first discuss a few points. Weinberger can be considered the most mobile U.S. secretary of defense. In only the first 14 months of his term in office he visited 26 countries.

Soviet analyst [name indistinct] writes: Wherever swordsman Caspar sets his foot he is followed by an arms race. Neutron bombs are sent to West Europe, AWACS planes to Saudi Arabia, and so on and so forth. It is because of this belligerant nature that Weinberger has come to be known by U.S. correspondents as Caspar the swordsman.

During his recent visit to the Persian Gulf, Weinberger did not change his policy. His objective was to put pressure on the Arab countries to force them to jump on the bandwagon of Washington's adventurism in the Persian Gulf and to gain for the Pentagon the right to set up new military bases in their territories. Observers focus especially on the fact that during the U.S. defense secretary's visit to the Persian Gulf U.S. helicopters fired on Iran's *Iran Ajr*, an act which seriously exacerbated the situation in the region. After all, this dangerous attack came shortly before the U.S. President's speech at the UN General Assembly, assuring his audience that the White House does not pursue hostile objectives in the Persian Gulf.

Weinberger visits various corners of the world as a traveling preacher of anticommunism who hypnotizes his audiences with words about the Soviet threat. He did so this time as well. Moreover, his visits to Saudi Arabia

and Bahrain were coupled with a propaganda campaign by the U.S. mass media and by some pro-U.S. Arab newspapers, which distorted the Soviet stand on the Persian Gulf. They extolled the U.S. emphasis on the use of force and accused the Soviet Union of believing in and supporting a diplomatic solution to the Iran-Iraq conflict. A political solution conforms with the spirit of UN Security Council Resolution 598, and the latest debates of the permanent members of the Security Council confirm this.

Washington's policy of exacerbating tension in the Persian Gulf was not generally supported by the Arab countries. It is no accident that the director of the U.S. military machinery was unable to obtain their agreement on granting the Pentagon new military privileges. We should also point out that during the Pentagon director's visit to the Persian Gulf, congressmen introduced a new clause to a military expenditures bill under discussion. According to this clause, 30 days after the bill becomes law the President must give Congress convincing evidence of the need to escort Kuwaiti tankers. [Words indistinct], otherwise the lawmakers will forbid this. Weinberger has not hidden his rage at the congressmen's attempts to (?ban) U.S. military activities in the Persian Gulf, describing this as sheer stupidity. But even in the United States not everyone thinks like him. Many believe that [words indistinct] can have tragic outcomes.

Redman Cited on Shevardnadze UNGA Speech

PM291459 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Sep 87 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent A. Shalnev dispatch: "United Nations: What Is Being Said After the Soviet Minister's Speech"]

[Excerpt] New York—"Is a text of the speech available?" This question was being asked in the UN Press Center from early morning. Journalists, and not just journalists, were keen to find out what the USSR foreign minister would say from the UN General Assembly rostrum in a few hours' time.

A long line formed in the Press Center where copies of the text were to be distributed. The impatience, prompted by a desire to scoop the competition and be the first to report the contents of the speech, was transparent: Every Soviet journalist immediately became the target of persistent requests and interrogation: "You probably already know what will be said"; "What assessment will be made of the situation in the Persian Gulf?"; "Anything specific on the date of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting?"

And so, the speech was delivered. The General Assembly hall is emptying. The delegates are taking a break.

I approached U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz and asked for his comments on what he had heard. Silence.

The same request was made of Rozanne Ridgway, assistant secretary for European and Canadian Affairs. "No comment," was the reply.

This is what General Vernon Walters, U.S. permanent representative to the United Nations, said: "Actually, I have nothing to say. Did you ask the secretary of state? Well, if he had nothing to say, what can I do? Somewhat awkward...."

Official reaction was nevertheless forthcoming, but a few hours later at a briefing session by State Department Spokesman Charles Redman held at the U.S. Mission at the United Nations. I quote:

"Here is our reaction very briefly. First, we are encouraged by what was said at the very beginning of the speech about the progress achieved and the prospects (in the matter of nuclear arms reduction—A.Sh.). We agree with much of what was said by Mr Shevardnadze in this context. But we are disappointed by the fact that the speech was not entirely delivered in that same tone. The minister spoke on several interesting topics like, for example, the Soviet Union's domestic development. We heard something new about mistakes of the past. Of course, we are pleased with the commitment to democratization which was confirmed in the speech.

"Nonetheless, it appears that the minister at times engaged in lecturing, although he himself criticized this approach in his speech. The sarcasm with regard to Ronald Reagan's speech at the General Assembly session seemed inappropriate. Be that as it may, we (in other words the USSR and the United States—A.Sh) do have an agenda. Much work lies ahead, and we intend to advance."

A brief statement, but it somehow says a lot — particularly about Washington's inclination to lecture others and lead them along "the right path," an inclination that is so noticeable in Reagan's speech and was noticed by many of the journalists and session delegates with whom I had an opportunity to converse in the last few days. Yet no one perceived any "lecturing" — invented by the Department of State — in the Soviet minister's speech. The assessments that are made are on a completely different plane. [passage omitted]

Visa Denied to Soviet Conference Attendee

LD291215 Moscow TASS in English 1200 GMT 29 Sep 87

[Text] Washington September 29 TASS—By TASS correspondent Vladimir Rogachev:

The U.S. Department of State has undertaken another unfriendly action with regard to the Soviet Union by denying an entry visa to V.V. Volskiy, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and Director of the Institute for Latin America.

The Soviet scientist was invited to the third biennial congress of the International Federation of Latin American and Caribbean Studies in Buffalo, New York state.

A State Department spokesman said that the decision was adopted on the strength of the law banning entry to persons involved in activities undermining U.S. security.

The spokesman was unable to specify charges against the Soviet scientist.

The New York Times reported that the delegates to the congress, angry at the administration's step, had sent a message of protest to Secretary of State George Shultz.

This is not the first instance when the U.S. Department of State, invoking the immigration and nationality, bans entry to various delegations and workers of science and culture.

In March this year, a Soviet delegation was not allowed to attend a conference on issues of labour protection and safety, in April, a group of Cuban art workers was denied entry.

In the past, President of the World Peace Council Romesh Chandra, Nobel literature prize winner Gabiel Garcia Marquez of Colombia, Mexican author Carlos Fuentes and many others whose activity and statements were against the liking of official Washington were denied entry into the United States.

Peace Activists 'Abandon' Stereotypes of USSR

LD300925 Moscow TASS in English 0743 GMT 30 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow September 29 TASS—Members of the organisation, "U.S.-USSR: Bridges for Peace", who are staying in the USSR at the invitation of the Moscow Patriarchy, had to abandon the negative stereotypes about the Soviet Union after a ten-day stay in the country. They made this statement at a press conference held at the publishing department of the Moscow Patriarchy today.

The organisation's director, Richard Hough Ross, who is heading the delegation, noted that in five years of its existence the organisation tried to stave off a nuclear war. He expressed his conviction that the level of fear and suspicions, misgivings and mistrust was based on ignorance and poor understanding of the real state of affairs rather than on real facts.

The peace organisation unites more than 50 church, civil, women's and other groups which aim to foster better understanding between the USA and the USSR.

Richard Hough Ross stressed that by showing good will the USA and the USSR could become partners in the struggle agianst mankind's real enemies: hunger, poverty, disease and illiteracy.

The delegation of the U.S. peacemakers returned to Moscow today after a tour of the Soviet Union, which included Kiev, the capital of the Ukraine, and Voronezh (Russian Federation). The guests got acquainted themselves [as received] with the work of mass organisations supporting peace, visited churches and attended services.

The members of the delegation told the press conference about the friendly reception in the Soviet Union.

IZVESTIYA Carries Interview With Cuomo

PM291137 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Sep 87 Morning Edition p 5

["IZVESTIYA Interview" with Governor of New York State Mario Cuomo by A. Ivanko: "Mario Cuomo: What Could Be More Important Than Survival?"; date, place of interview not specified; first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] The visit to the USSR by New York State Governor Mario Cuomo at the invitation of the RSFSR Council of Ministers has attracted the attention of the Western mass media. Despite the fact that the governor has said more than once that he does not intend to run in the 1988 presidential election Americans are still asking the question: "But suppose he does?" This largely explains the attention paid by journalists to Cuomo's visit to the Soviet Union. Although the trip was planned in advance, interest in it was heightened also by the fact that Mario Cuomo is the first senior U.S. figure to visit our country since the constructive and fruitful talks in Washington on medium- and shorter-range missiles. It was with an assessment of this event that the conversation with the governor began.

[Cuomo] I believe that the Soviet-U.S. joint statement, if it is followed by accords on verification issues, will be seen as an event of enormous significance in the history of our relations and, accordingly, in world history, inasmuch as the state of Soviet-U.S. relations exercises a direct influence on the world situation. If the agreement is ratified by the governments of the USSR and the United States it will be the first occasion in history when we have started to destroy armaments — yet another step toward a more civilized society. The agreement would also create a precedent which, hopefully, would be followed by accords on strategic offensive armaments, chemical weapons, conventional armaments, prohibition of nuclear tests, regional conflicts — on Afghanistan, for example — and on human rights. It is a difficult political agenda, but if the first agreement comes into being it will show that we are capable of tackling difficult problems. Until an agreement has been concluded it is not that easy, but we in the United States — not everyone, but a majority — are grateful to the President, and I am sure that the Soviet people are grateful to Gorbachev, and we are grateful to Shevardnadze and Shultz for what has now been done. The accord that has

been reached could be a turning point in history or it could be a small episode that will soon be forgotten. I hope it will be a turning point.

[Ivanko] Could you dwell in greater detail on other aspects of the Soviet-U.S. relations you mentioned?

[Cuomo] An agreement on medium-range missiles does not solve much in itself. It is an important precedent, but only 3-4 percent of the nuclear potential will have been destroyed. There will be enough left for us to bury one another. The agreement will not in itself make the world a much safer place. So talks on strategic armaments are very important. Gorbachev has said that he believes in the possibility of reaching an agreement on a radical reduction of strategic armaments as early as the beginning of next year. That would be splendid. When the disarmament issues have been solved it will be easier to settle the other items on the agenda, although here too there are problems.

Afghanistan. A serious problem for the Soviet Union, and you have said so. Shevardnadze said that a political decision has been made to withdraw the forces from Afghanistan — this would suit everyone. But the Soviet Union cannot quit the country and leave behind a regime that is hostile to it. We appreciate that. The United States will stop aiding the rebels as soon as Soviet forces leave Afghanistan, but not before. If we stop helping and you stay there, you will have attained the goals you set in 1979, and the United States will not offer you any assistance here. At the moment I do not see what part we can play in the solution of the problem put forward by the United Nations. The USSR wants to withdraw its forces but does not yet know precisely how to do it. So the solution depends primarily on the Soviet Union.

Human rights. Foreign Minister Shevardnadze and Secretary of State Shultz announced that there had been a constructive discussion of these matters. What the future outcome will be I do not know. You have proposed holding a conference in the Soviet Union; we have not replied as yet at government level.

There has been some progress on the question of banning chemical weapons. It will be possible to solve a great deal if we are able to reach an agreement on medium-range missiles. It will raise the level of mutual trust, and if our two governments conduct relations in accordance with the principles of mutual advantage and mutual respect, then miracles are possible.

[Ivanko] How do you view the Soviet stance on concluding an agreement on strategic armaments conditional on observance of the ABM Treaty for at least 10 years?

[Cuomo] The Soviet Union is urging nonwithdrawal from the ABM Treaty. But Reagan, as he has repeatedly said, does not intend to abandon the SDI program. Unless the positions change, there will be no treaty on strategic armaments. Compromises are needed. I believe Academician Sakharov is right to think that the SDI program is ultimately unrealistic. Basically, one needs to reach a compromise solution.

[Ivanko] Although you get many invitations to visit other countries you rarely leave the United States. Why did you decide to come to the Soviet Union?

[Cuomo] I am very flattered by the abundance of invitations. Unfortunately, I cannot respond to them all since a governor has a great deal of work to do. But for me, father of five children, citizen of the United States, and governor of 18 million people, what could be more important than the question of life and death? What could be more important than survival? What could be more important than the desire to put a stop to the enormous, crazy expenditure on instruments of death which cannot be used, when you need money for restructuring and we need it to solve our problems? What could be more important than a decision that makes such funds available? Instead of piling missile upon missile we must spend the money on people. Do you know how much the missiles we have now agreed to destroy cost? Nine billion dollars have been thrown away because we are too stupid. My mother never had any education. She will be 86 soon and this is what she says: How could we be so stupid, if the President and the politicians are smart people, why have they thrown this money down the drain? And she is right.

[Ivanko] What part will the fact of the achievement of a Soviet-U.S. agreement play in the 1988 presidential election? Will it not be an advantage for the Republicans?

[Cuomo] Since this is one of the most important issues it will obviously be discussed. But if they manage to conclude an agreement everyone will be on the same side, so it will not be the chief issue in the election campaign. The Republicans will start saying "It is our achievement," and they are right. We will say "Yes, of course, but you took too long to get there. Instead of calling them the "empire of evil" you should have sat down at the negotiating table then." And so on and so forth. The majority — Republicans and Democrats — are in agreement on this. Apart from ultraconservative Republicans, perhaps, but their opinion does not reflect public opinion.

[Ivanko] I ask my last question because it is the "fashionable" thing to ask at the moment: Do you see yourself in the U.S. President's chair?

[Cuomo] No, no...

Canadian Parliamentarians Visit Minsk

LD300924 Moscow TASS in English 0750 GMT 30 Sep 87

[Text] Minsk September 29 TASS—Visiting house members of the Canadian Parliament Robert A. Corbett, Robert Pennock and Howard E. Crosby ended a two-day stay in the capital of Belorussia.

The guests were received by Georgiy Tarazevich, president of the Presidium of the republic's Supreme Soviet. He briefed them on the activities of legislative bodies, their participation in solving the tasks of socio-economic development and democratisation of the republic's socio-political life. A meeting took place between the first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belorussia, member of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Yefrem Sokolov, and the Canadian guests. During the talk conviction was expressed that the stay of the members of the Canadian Parliament in the Soviet Union and the forthcoming visit of a delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet to Canada will have a beneficial influence on the development of parliamentary ties, better understanding and extended mutually beneficial cooperation between the two countries.

The guests acquainted themselves with the sights of the Belorussian capital.

The Canadian MPs left for Leningrad tonight.

China

PRAVDA Reports Zhao Ziyang NBC Interview

PM291315 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Sep 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Interview With Zhao Ziyang"]

[Text] Beijing, 28 Sep—Zhao Ziyang, acting general secretary of the CPC Central Committee and premier of the PRC State Council, has said that China "welcomes the principled agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States to eliminate medium-range missiles and operational-tactical missiles." "We hope," he stressed, "that Soviet-U.S. relations will improve." In an interview with the American NBC radio and television company, the Chinese leader also said that better relations and reduced confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States will contribute to the task of reducing international tension and strengthening peace throughout the world. *Xinhua* carried a report on this interview.

Touching on the subject of Soviet-Chinese relations, Zhao Ziyang noted an improvement in ties between the two countries in the trade and economic, scientific and technical, and cultural spheres, and also an increase in exchanges of visits. "I believe that Sino-Soviet relations will improve in these areas, as it is to the advantage of both sides," the Chinese leader said.

Noting the resumption of border talks between the Soviet Union and the PRC, Zhao Ziyang said that the border issue cannot be resolved at a stroke. However, he stressed, on the whole the matter is progressing relatively well.

At the same time he said that political relations between China and the Soviet Union remain unchanged and that they depend on the removal of "three obstacles" and especially on whether the question of withdrawing Vietnamese troops from Cambodia can be resolved.

Discussing the forthcoming 13th CPC Congress, the Chinese leader noted that it will mainly examine reform issues. The congress will discuss the plan to implement this reform further and also the program for the reform of the political structure. China has no reason to delay the reform, as it has benefited the people and has their support, Zhao Ziyang observed.

"China," he said, "is such a large country. Without the leading role of the Communist Party and without loyalty to the socialist system, it would be impossible to maintain stability and cohesion and China would be plunged into chaos."

He emphasized that the reform and policy of expanding ties with the outside world do not signify any change in China's socialist social system or any abandonment of the CPC'S leading role. The success of this reform and policy depends on whether China manages to shake off conservative, obsolete ideas and also right-wing ideas which have the aim of leading the reform from its socialist path.

Answering questions by U.S. journalists, the Chinese leader noted that the PRC has not sold weapons to Iran and avoids any action which could impede reconciliation between Iran and Iraq. At the same time he did not rule out the possibility that Iran may have bought Chinese manufactured weapons on international markets. "We are doing everything possible to prevent Chinese weapons from being relayed through other channels in the future."

Dwelling on Chinese-U.S. relations, he noted their progressive development and the successes achieved. However, Zhao Ziyang said, "The main source of worry and concern in PRC-U.S. relations is still the Taiwan problem." The U.S. law on new U.S.-Taiwan relations "has always cast a shadow over Chinese-U.S. relations," he said.

Ties with PRC, Cambodia Question Assessed

OW291403 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0300 GMT 28 Sep 87

[Alekseyev commentary]

[Excerpts] The Soviet Union stands for further expanding ties with China, including ties in international affairs, said an article published in *Izvestiya* on 25 September. The Soviet people are pleased with the fact that our two countries share similar or identical views on a number of major international issues. At the same time, we, of course, do not ignore the conspicuous

differences between the Soviet Union and China in certain areas. The Cambodian question is a case in point. On this, our station observer Alekseyev has the following today:

Although the Soviet Union and China differ in their attitudes toward the Cambodian issue, both countries, I must point out, call for a peaceful political settlement of this question. The Soviet Union is convinced that the national reconciliation program put forth by the Government of the People's Republic of Cambodia will become a practical solution to this question. [passage omitted]

It is our belief that the national reconciliation policy pursued by the Cambodian government does not undermine Chine's interests and conforms with the long-range goal to set up a peaceful and stable region along China's southern border.

Beijing Citizens 'Building Socialism'
LD292259 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 29 Sep 87

[Vladimir Kulikov report from Beijing; From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The inhabitants of Beijing consider September to be the best time of the year. These days it seems that the whole of the town's population has come out, or rather has cycled out, onto the streets of the Chinese capital.

Traffic jams are turning into a serious problem. The streets have responded to this with numerous slogans and posters. A slogan asserts: You will find happiness in safe roads. In Beijing at the moment there are fairly few billboards of Western firms. They have been replaced by flowers. Almost a million bunches have been used to decorate the town. Bright flower beds and colorful panels have been put together with them. The flowers are a reminder that it will soon be a national day — the 38th anniversary of the People's Republic.

The results of what has been done are being summed up. They are not simple in character. China today is a dynamic, developing country that is resolutely ridding itself of all that is stagnant and obsolete, and reacting flexibly to the demands of life. But there are many difficult problems in the country, and as yet not everything is going successfully, as in any new venture. But the main thing is the resolve to build a new socialist China, and to go along the path of reforms. This gives confidence.

Building socialism in China has entered a new and important stage in its development, and one wants to believe that the hundreds of thousands of bunches of flowers that appeared on Beijing's streets over these autumnal, festive days will become a good omen along this path. Another sign of autumn in Beijing is the holiday trade: It has a special feature.

A month has passed since the governmental decree on individual labor activity was published. The new law extends the opportunities of individual enterprises. It is possible to take out loans, open bank accounts, hire workers, and take on apprentices. The green streets of Beijing have become free markets — as they are called here, too. Such markets are open until late. Trade at the markets has a strikingly seasonal nature. People are sold what they need now in autumn, not in summer or winter. This is why there is a lively interest on the part of the buyers, and of course Beijing's women fashion followers.

Northeast Asia

Japan Plans To Send Escort Ship to Gulf
LD182243 Moscow TASS in English 2132 GMT 18 Sep 87

[Text] Tokyo September 18 TASS—TASS correspondent Aleksandr Anichkin reporting:

Japan is going to send to the Persian Gulf an escort ship from its maritime safety agency (its units actually perform the function of Japan's border guard force). Transport Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto announced today that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was already studying the issue.

Originally, according to the newspaper *Sankei Shimbun*, it was planned to send a Japanese mine-sweeper to the Persian Gulf. However, later the Foreign Ministry began considering the possibility of sending an escort ship from the Maritime Safety Agency to that zone.

Such a ship is useless as a mine-sweeper and it is, therefore, planned to limit its functions to salvage operations and the provision of medical aid to the seamen wounded in the zone of combat operations.

Japanese tankers and other ships came under repeated attacks in the Persian Gulf.

Despite the constitutional ban on the dispatch of Japanese armed forces abroad, Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone recently said in parliament that Japanese naval ships, specifically mine-sweepers, could, in principle, be sent to the Persian Gulf zone.

This "amendment" to one of the basic principles of the country's foreign policy was made in Tokyo on Washington's demand (the United States insists that Japan "share the burden" of U.S. military obligations) in the Persian Gulf.

Tokyo believes that there is another way for supporting Washington's military efforts. It is a partial funding of the U.S. operations, including the transfer of funds directly to the Pentagon.

Moscow on COCOM Rules Hurting Japanese Trade

OW290645 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 28 Sep 87

[Tokyo correspondent Patapov report]

[Text] The Toshiba Machine Co. has been accused of strengthening the Soviet submarine fleet by exporting four sets of digital-controlled machine tools to the Soviet Union. A rumor, started by the United States, is also going around that many other Japanese enterprises have exported to the socialist countries, including the Soviet Union, various items banned for export in violation of COCOM [Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls] regulations. Making a concession to the U.S. demand, the Japanese Government has adopted oppressive measures to control exports that will result in a decrease in future trade with the socialist countries.

It has been more and more frequently pointed out in business circles and among social organizations in Japan that COCOM and its discriminatory measures do not conform to the spirit of the times, and that control over trade will only bring about losses to the Japanese economy. Commentators have pointed out that COCOM, founded on a U.S. proposal, is a tool for the United States to oppress its competitors in trade. Topmost among these competitors is Japan, which has come to play the leading role in many fields of modern technology. Despite the fact that the United States itself is involved in 85 percent of the cases violating COCOM regulations, all the criticism has been centered on Japan, and Japan is now on the verge of losing its large market in the socialist countries.

In regard to COCOM, Japanese CP Dietman Zenmei Matsumoto has said: COCOM is closely connected with NATO and the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty. COCOM regulations have controlled Japan's foreign trade while strengthening Japan's military alliance with the United States. We resolutely demand that Japan withdraw from COCOM and that all military blocs be disbanded. Since the Japanese Government's participation in the SDI program, COCOM has apparently intensified its control over Japan. As a result, Japan's trade with the socialist countries, including the Soviet Union, has decreased. If COCOM's discriminatory measures should be intensified, Japan's exports to socialist countries might be completely prohibited. In that case, the role of Japanese enterprises will be taken over by West European enterprises, and Japan will be the only country to suffer damages.

KYODO Correspondent on Gorbachev Article

OW190619 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 18 Sep 87

[Text] The Soviet Newspaper *Pravda* carries foreign correspondents' reactions to General Secretary Gorbachev's article entitled: "The Reality and Guarantees of a Secure World." We will now introduce one of these reactions, a commentary by correspondent Kazuhiro Ezawa of the KYODO News Agency, which says:

It was 0100 when TASS carried this article by General Secretary Gorbachev. Nevertheless, I dispatched to Tokyo a long report summarizing this article. I played up the report that General Secretary Gorbachev had stated the possibility of working out a treaty on abolishing medium, operational, and strategic missiles by the end of this year. I also emphasized the point that according to General Secretary Gorbachev, through mutual efforts, this agreement will promote an accord to be decided during the first half of 1988 on prior agreement on the reduction of strategic offensive weapons by 50 percent, on the condition of strict adherence to the treaty on the limitation of antiballistic missiles. I feel this is one of the key points in General Secretary Gorbachev's article. It is difficult for me to state what response this article will arouse at this moment. However, I am sure it will arouse great interest in Japan.

JSP EC Delegation Visits USSR 19-25 Sep

PM291357 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Sep 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Familiarization with USSR"]

[Text] A delegation from the Japanese Socialist Party Central Executive Committee's Theory of Socialism Center headed by K. Kawasaki, leader of the center and Japanese parliament deputy, was in the Soviet Union 19 through 25 September at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee.

The delegation familiarized itself with the essence and progress of restructuring in the Soviet Union. It was received at the CPSU Central Committee International Department and Leningrad CPSU Obkom, met with scientists at the CPSU Central Committee Social Sciences Academy and the USSR Academy of Sciences United States and Canada Institute, and visited industrial and agricultural enterprises in Leningrad City and Mosocw Oblast.

JSP Delegation Meets Kim Il-song 28 Sep

PM291255 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Sep 87 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Commonality of Interests"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 28 Sep—The attainment of the agreement in principle between the USSR and the United States on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles attests that mankind is seeking an opportunity to shift from the senseless buildup of nuclear armaments to an era of disarmament and a nuclear-free world, Takako Doi, chairman of the Japanese Socialist Party [JSP] Central Executive Committee, has stated here. She was heading a JSP delegation which was visiting the DPRK.

During her talks with Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Workers Party of Korea Central Committee and president of the DPRK, the JSP leader announced the intention to organize an international conference on questions of disarmament and peace in the Asian and Pacific region. In this connection she assessed highly the DPRK's proposals for a gradual reduction of armed forces on the Korean peninsula, including the unilateral steps it is taking in this direction, and other initiatives aimed at the country's peaceful unification.

The Korean side stated its support for the JSP's policy aimed at the defense of Japan's "three nonnuclear principles," its demilitarization, nonparticipation in alliances, and active neutrality. The talks and conversations that have taken place, Kim Il-song noted, have made it possible to note the commonality of the positions of the Workers Party of Korea and the JSP on questions of the further expansion and development of relations of friendship and cooperation.

U.S. 'Violation' of DPRK Airspace Noted

LD300344 Moscow TASS in English 2338 GMT 29 Sep 87

["US Plane Violates DPRK Air Space"—TASS headline]

[Text] Pyongyang September 29 TASS—According to the Korean Central News Agency, a U.S. reconnaissance aircraft, SR-71, today flew over the territorial waters of the Democratic Republic of Korea along the eastern coast of the republic from the town of Kosong, Kangwon Province, to the town of Kim Chaek, Hamgyong Pukdo Province. The news agency notes that 14 such violations have been registered this month.

The continued violations by U.S. Air Force planes into the DPRK air space, the news agency stresses, are evidence that Washington is not interested in the relaxation of tension on the Korean peninsula.

Orlov, Delegation Continue Mongolian Visit

PM181007 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Sep 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Interparliamentary Ties"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation led by V.P. Orlov, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, which is in Mongolia at the invitation of the Mongolian People's Great Hural, has visited Darhan—a young industrial center. The Soviet parliamentarians were received in the Darhan City Hural of People's Deputies Executive Administration, where they were familiarized with its work. They also visited a food combine, a vocational-technical school, and a sheepskin enterprise created with the assistance of the Soviet Union and Bulgaria. The labor collectives gave the Soviet guests a warm welcome.

Today the delegation returned to Ulaanbaatar.

Dolgikh Activities in Ulaanbaatar 25 Sep

PM291421 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Sep 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Working Visit"]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 25 Sep—The working visit to Mongolia by V.I. Dolgikh, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, continues. He had a meeting today in the Soviet embassy with the party and economic aktiv of Soviet organizations giving fraternal assistance to Mongolia in socialist building. In his speech the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee talked about the restructuring currently under way in the country in the light of the decisions adopted by the 27th CPSU Congress and subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums, and dwelt on the tasks of deepening Soviet-Mongolian economic, scientific, and technical cooperation and making it more effective. He was familiarized with the work of the Ulaanbaatar Motor Vehicle Repair Plant, and visited the Marshal of the Soviet Union G.K. Zhukov Museum in Ulaanbaatar, the State Central Museum, and the Fine Art Museum. He was accompanied by B. Dejid, member of the MPRP Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the MPRP Central Committee, and P. Damdin, candidate member of the MPRP Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the MPRP Central Committee.

A dinner was given on behalf of the MPRP Central Committee.

Near East & South Asia

Further Developments in Gulf Situation

PM291135 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Sep 87 Morning Edition p 1

[IZVESTIYA Press Service report: "Alarming Stage"]

[Text] Iranian President S.A. Khamene'i has stated that the destruction by the Americans of the Iranian ship they seized "proves that the United States has committed an act of piracy."

"If the United States had not lied and could have provided a logical explanation for its actions there would have been no need to destroy the ship," he said. The United States, as is well known, explains its attack on the Iranian ship *Iran Ajr* by the fact that its crew was

allegedly mining international waters. The Iranian Government refutes this fact. The photographs the Americans took of the Iranian ship "were not displayed" and the ship itself was blown up and sunk by the U.S. Navy on Friday.

U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger has concluded his visit to Saudi Arabia and Bahrain. On Sunday he stated in a TV interview that the United States intends to continue its policy in the Gulf with a view toward "ensuring freedom of navigation." The head of the Pentagon also sharply attacked the Iranian leadership, claiming that the Iran-Iraq war could only end after the Iranian Government was replaced.

H. Sheykh-ol-Eslam, Iranian deputy foreign minister, gave an interview to West Germany's DPA agency in which he stated that Tehran "will undertake a limited military operation in response to the U.S. attack on the *Iran Ajr*."

Commenting on the development of the situation in the Gulf, Britain's *The Sunday Times* notes that hostilities in the region have "switched to a new and alarming stage." For its part *The Observer* newspaper states: "President Reagan and Prime Minister Thatcher may find it hard to admit that the greatest threat to peace is posed not by the Iranians or the Iraqis, but by the dozens of warships plying the Gulf."

At the same time hostilities are continuing on the Iran-Iraq front. Baghdad has reported that in the last 2 days the Iraqi Air Force has attacked and hit five ships in the Gulf, as well as bombing economic installations on Iranian territory.

Tehran radio claims that two Iraqi planes were downed and that Iranian artillery has bombarded an Iraqi power station.

Belyayev Views Gulf After 'Iran Ajr'
PM291130 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 30 Sep 87 p 9

[Igor Belyayev "Observer's Opinion": "The Persian Gulf: What's What"]

[Text] There is a further exacerbation of the "tanker war" in the waters of the Persian Gulf. American and British naval forces fired on Iranian warships and launches. The reason for the salvos? The Iranians were supposedly laying mines in the international waters of the Gulf. A report flashed in that one of them, the *Iran Ajr*, after it was seized by the Americans, was found to have 10 mines on board.

It is noteworthy that Tehran did not at first reject the Americans' assertions. It was only pointed out that the *Iran Ajr* was carrying a cargo of food, probably to one of the Iranian ports. Later, however, Iran admitted that the *Iran Ajr*, which was attacked on 22 September, belonged to the Iranian Navy, but denied that its crew was laying mines...

What happened in the Persian Gulf last week prompts unpleasant reflections. The question arises: Who has laid and is laying mines in the international waters of the Gulf, and also around Kuwaiti ports?

If you remember the extremely bellicose threats that have and continue to be made against the State of Kuwait by Tehran, an apposite question arises: On what grounds? After all, Iran is fighting Iraq, no? Iran has not declared war on the State of Kuwait, and therefore, if the norms of international law are adhered to, it cannot regard it as a "warring party." And therefore its threats against Kuwait, and against other Arab countries located on the shores of the Persian Gulf, are inappropriate.

Another unfounded assertion is being pushed. This is the assertion to the effect that Kuwait, having turned to the Soviet Union and the United States with a request to be granted the potential to protect its oil freight and tankers, has supposedly "invited the Americans" into the waters of the Gulf (the USSR offered its tankers for hire). To me, "accusations" of this kind against Kuwait look provocative. Kuwait was defending itself. At the same time Kuwait comes out firmly against the creation of American bases both on its territory and elsewhere. Note that the list of countries that will receive a visit from U.S. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger during his tour of the Gulf region does not mention Kuwait. Is this a coincidence? I think not. Kuwaiti Foreign Minister Sabah al-Ahmad al-Jabir al-Sabah, who always amazes me with the wisdom of his foreign policy decisions, took that decision after profound thought...

Well, as for the threats against the Arab countries of the Gulf, how do they differ from open political terrorism? Of course, the U.S. transformation of the Persian Gulf into a powder keg is fraught with unforeseen consequences. And these must be prepared for now. Especially since what happens there is by no means a matter of indifference to the Soviet Union. After all, it is a question of events near our southern borders. Moscow is in favor not of mining the waters of the Gulf, but of clearing them of mines. I do not suppose the mines being scattered there have the capacity to be selective. They could blow up Soviet merchant and naval ships entering the Gulf...

The United States, I wish to mention yet again, is deliberately whipping up the military-political situation in the Persian Gulf, and not only in connection with the "tanker war." Realizing that this could now turn into an utter disaster for themselves, people in Washington have suddenly remembered UN Security Council Resolution 598, adopted 20 July this year, and the need to impose an embargo on weapons deliveries to Iran. Along with the seizure and sinking of the Iranian warship *Iran Ajr*,

all this looks like open military presure. Yes, on Iran. Although an American-Iranian war remains unlikely, the United States is bringing pressure to bear on Iran with one objective—to return to that country so as to be able to use it as a bridgehead against the Soviet Union. Support for the undeclared war against Afghanistan fits in perfectly with the attainment of this objective. In recent days an increase in American aid to the Afghan dushmans has become known. Washington continues to regard Afghanistan as the "back door" to Iran, and therefore the tense military-political situation must be maintained there...

Iran has supposedly declared its readiness to acknowledge UN Security Council Resolution 598, but, as always, with conditions. In particular, it demands a verdict on the aggressors. Well, that amounts to continuing not to recognize the resolution, which called for a cease-fire on the Iran-Iraq fronts.

Deputy Foreign Minister Meets Iranian Envoy

LD301106 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian 1030 GMT 30 Sep 87

[Text] In the course of meetings yesterday afternoon between Yuliy Vorontsov, Soviet deputy foreign minister, and Naser Hayrani-Nobari, the ambassador of the Islamic Republic of Iran to Moscow, the Soviet deputy foreign minister gave Hayrani-Nobari a report on the recent Security Council meeting that was held at the United Nations with the participation of the UN secretary general and the foreign ministers of the five permanent members of the Security Council.

Regarding the crisis in the Persian Gulf the Soviet deputy foreign minister said: It is the nature of U.S. imperialism to make use of its power in criminal acts. In this meeting, the two sides discussed the plans proposed at the UN Security Council, regional issues, and bilateral cooperation.

Petrovskiy Meets Lebanon's Al-Jumayyil in NY

LD300540 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0517 GMT 30 Sep 87

[Text] New York 30 Sep (TASS)—A meeting took place here Tuesday between Lebanese President Amin al-Jumayyil and V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs. They exchanged opinions on topical international issues and on some issues concerning bilateral relations.

Particular attention was paid to the need for a just and comprehensive Near East settlement in all its aspects, including the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the occupied territories, among them southern Lebanon. The way to this, the sides stressed, lies in the urgent convocation of an international conference on the Near East.

Lizichev, Delegation Arrive in YAR 25 Sep

PM291327 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Sep 87 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Arrival of Soviet Military Delegation"]

[Text] Sanaa, 25 September—A Soviet military delegation headed by Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, has arrived here at the invitation of the leadership of the Yemen Arab Republic [YAR] Armed Forces.

The delegation was met at the airport by Colonel A. al-Shayba, assistant commander in chief of the YAR Armed Forces; Colonel A. M. Salah, chief of General Staff of the YAR Armed Forces; Major A. K. al-Shatr, chief of the YAR Armed Forces Moral Orientation Administration; and other officials. V.V. Popov, USSR ambassador to the YAR, was among the reception party.

CPSU Group Leaves for Damascus Symposium

PM291331 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Sep 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "To Participate in Symposium"]

[Text] A group of CPSU representatives headed by Y. N. Yelchenko, member of the CPSU Central Committee and secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, flew from Moscow to Damascus 27 September to participate in the international symposium "October and the World's Renewal" devoted to the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

East Europe

Jaruzelski Meets With Vice President Bush

PM291317 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Sep 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Exchange of Opinions"]

[Text] Warsaw, 28 Sep—Wojciech Jaruzelski, chairman of the Polish Council of State, met with U.S. Vice President George Bush, who is on an official visit to Poland, at Nieborow near Warsaw 27 September.

During the talk economic problems concerning both Polish-U.S. relations and the activity of international organizations and institutions—including the IMF, the World Bank, and the Club of Paris—were examined. Questions of bilateral cooperation in the sphere of culture, science, and exchanges of information were also discussed.

Bulgarian Visitors Meet With Nishanov

PM291423 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Sep 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Deputies Exchange Experience"]

[Text] On 25 September R.N. Nishanov, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, met with a delegation of the Bulgarian National Assembly Legislation Commission headed by Y. Radev, deputy chairman of the Bulgarian State Council and chairman of the Legislation Commission.

During their friendly conversation it was noted that the exchange of experience as well as the deepening and improvement of comprehensive fraternal ties are acquiring special significance in the conditions of restructuring in the USSR and Bulgaria. The experiment of holding elections in local soviets in multicandidate constituencies, in particular, generated great interest among the guests.

A. Y. Rybakov, deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and M. Yotov, Bulgarian charge d'affaires in the USSR, took part in the conversation.

The delegation had a conversation on the same day at the Legislative Proposals Commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers. V.G. Lomonosov, deputy chairman of the the Soviet of Nationalities Legislative Proposals Comnmission, described the basic thrusts of the commissions' activity and the preparation of USSR legislative acts. The delegation members' attention was drawn to the practical implementation of the USSR Law on State Enterprises (Associations) and the USSR Law on Individual Labor Activity.

Bulgarian Leaders' Thanks for Greetings

PM291505 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Sep 87 Second Edition p 1

[Message of thanks from Todor Zhivkov, general secretary of the BCP Central Committee and chairman of the Bulgarian State Council; and Georgi Atanasov, chairman of the Bulgarian Council of Ministers, to the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the USSR Council of Ministers]

[Text] To the CPSU Central Committee The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium The USSR Council of Ministers

We sincerely thank you for the cordial congratulations and wishes in connection with the 43d anniversary of the socialist revolution in Bulgaria.

We would like to take this opportunity to express our profound satisfaction with the relations of fraternal friendship, close cooperation, and rapprochement between the BCP and the CPSU, and between Bulgaria and the USSR based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism.

Engaged in peaceful creative labor, our country together with the Soviet Union and the other socialist states will continue to make its contribution to the struggle to remove the nuclear threat, ensure disarmament, and strengthen peace and cooperation among the peoples.

Todor Zhivkov, general secretary of the BCP Central Committee and chairman of the Bulgarian State Council Georgi Atanasov, chairman of the Bulgarian Council of Ministers

West Europe

Gorbachev Addresses French Delegation

LD292210 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1825 GMT 29 Sep 87

[Address by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to a delegation of the French public in the Kremlin 29 September; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] Friends, I would like once again to welcome the initiative of the France-USSR Society, an initiative you have called "Initiative-87." I would like to do this not only by way of politeness and hospitality, but I wish to stress the great meaning, the political meaning, of this initiative.

It seems to me if one looks at the world today I would say it is characterized by anxiety and worry as to where this world is going. Perhaps to put it more exactly, if you wish to ask the question this way: What will be the way of the world which today finds itself at the crossroads? Either the way of further confrontation and tension, or the way, perhaps difficult, but nevertheless of quest, the way toward peace, cooperation, and mutual understanding.

That is why I view this "Initiative-87" precisely in this context. Today's imperatives are probably such that it is not only, and not so much, politicians who will in the future determine the direction of world processes, as far as the survival and protection of mankind is concerned, but probably with every day and with every stage will grow the voice of the public, of world public opinion, and of various political forces, regardless of their class content. In this sense I consider the "Initiative-87" a major political initiative worthy of welcome, for we on the Soviet side see in this a desire to join in the search for ways toward mutual understanding and cooperation, toward an adjustment in relations and respect for one another, and toward a change in the whole atmosphere that could subsequently be transformed into policy, and in this way into a new character and type of international relations. This is an acceptable situation to us.

The whole tradition of our foreign policy comes from Lenin, that is, people's diplomacy. So when we are accused of propaganda, I cannot agree with it. It is another matter if, through some step of ours, our messages to the people of various countries over the heads of the governments to public opinion have a propaganda effect, have some sort of propagandist influence. That is another matter.

We proceed from realities: one cannot build a new type of relationship, of international relations between states and peoples, without the participation of the public forces of the world—the people themselves. I think those politicians who adopt this view will receive support. The people have great prospects for being in the mainstream of political life. The converse, those who openly come out and ignore these views or engage in politicking— and politicking is always linked with deception— their fate will not be long in the political field. I am profoundly convinced of this.

On this plane and from this standpoint I take your "Initiative-87." I value it highly, and I think it is a good example for all countries, for the public of other countries, including the Soviet Union.

For this reason, I thank you for this initiative, for it carries great political weight, and it includes great interest, deep meaning. I sense the mood of the French people in this initiative. That is the main thing. As a result of this, we are sitting together in this hall, exchanging views in a friendly atmosphere, comparing our views, asking questions to clarify them to some extent. We may get some things confused, but I think we will make things clear, nonetheless.

I was very glad to hear what was said here—as I understand, on behalf of all the delegates and with their authority—by both the chairman of the France-USSR Association, Madeleine Gilbert, whom we know already—and we in the Soviet Union appreciate very highly her contribution to Soviet-French friendship—and the contributions of all other participants in this meeting, who have made very short statements rich in content.

One could hear in them interest in understanding what is happening in the Soviet Union, a desire to better understand our intentions in our internal policy and to understand our plans as far as international policy is concerned. I also heard words of support for our efforts in both these directions. I thank you for that.

I recently finished work on a booklet on those questions, on restructuring and thought, which to a certain extent sums up everything considered, undertaken, and done over those years, over the present, and on plans for the future. In a short introductory address to the reader, I said we very much want to be correctly understood—we, the Soviet leadership and the Soviet people—by all peoples, including the Europeans, our natural neighbors with whom we share a common history and a common fate, and, I hope, a common happy future in our European house—so we may be correctly understood in our intentions as far as our restructuring, new thought, and foreign policy is concerned. We hope for more than understanding but also sympathy, solidarity, and support. From the whole pluralistic complex present here—it is necessary to say the words—gratitude. Directly from those utterances I am throwing a bridge over to the next topic, which concerns you, and with a better understanding of which you would like to return to France. I have in mind our restructuring. It is our internal matter.

Restructuring was engendered from the internal needs of our country. It is not an invention, or contrived venture, but a group of people which suddenly realized some kind of restructuring was necessary. No. Our life led to restructuring.

You already know a lot, you have heard a lot, and you will still hear a lot, and I do not want to recount everything restructuring represents, what it includes. I want to enlighten you as to our intentions. That will be shorter, and perhaps more convincing.

We are proud of our history. We are proud of our revolution in the same way France is proud of the French Revolution, which was a vast contribution to the history of mankind from the French people— and not the only one. The Revolution provided the opportunity to bring our country out of the difficult state it was in at the beginning of the 20th Century. In 70 years we have come a long way. The Soviet Union, thanks precisely to the Revolution, thanks to the fact that it made such a choice, a socialist choice, is today the way you see it. This is a modern state of enormous achievements. It is a society which has at its disposal enormous political, intellectual, scientific, and natural potential.

This is a society with many problems which exist in the political process and in our democracy, as well as in the social sphere, the economy, the spiritual sphere, and the sphere of morality and ethics. Restructuring is needed to resolve them , to remove the accumulated problems and contradictions, and to give a second wind to socialism in the interests of the people on the basis of socialist values. We are not playing cunning tricks— either with our own people or with people of other countries.

We continue to develop and consolidate socialism. We will modernize the economy and develop the process of democracy on the principles of socialism. We will preserve the people's social security, enjoyed by and characteristic of socialist society.

Today we are dissatisfied with the country's level of development and its situation, but we want to have a better society in all its dimensions. But even today a Soviet citizen has strong social guarantees: He is guaranteed the right to work—he has the opportunity to work. He has access to housing, although many problems exist,

and this is a free of charge, inexpensive; secondary and higher education are free, as well as medical services. This creates a person's guarantee and confidence.

On the basis of these general guarantees, others start to function—not others, but the principle of socialism: From each according to one's ability, to each according to one's work, for we cannot provide, as can be provided by communism, the society of the future, according to one's needs. So we have one criteria: To provide according to work, talent, and contribution to society and to developing the economy and the country. The mechanisms have been tested by our experience—and they work.

We do not renounce socialism; we want to make it better. This is why we say: more socialism. We do not renounce our democracy, but we are utilizing the possibilities of socialist democracy. We say— not simply democracy but socialist democracy— to stress social democracy must distinguish itself first and foremost by the fact that in it, the relative share and decisive word belong to the workers, to demos, and to the people. There is a lack of this now, so we are expanding the process of democracy and the processes of glasnost, which would encompass the party, the entire political system, the public organizations and the economy.

We want working people at enterprises to feel themselves real masters, to elect leaders, from shopfloor foreman to the enterprise leader. We want them, having united in a council, to tackle the issues of planning and prospects for their development, to take part in forming and distributing profits, to tackle social issues. This is where we aim to move our process of democracy, to deepen and expand it— into all spheres in a similar way.

When they say: What are the limits for restructuring, glasnost, and democracy in the framework of the process underway? Everything that strengthens socialism, in the framework of glasnost and democracy, should be supported and welcomed. But if—and this is already happening— people inside our country and out want to use the process of our openness and glasnost to instigate the extremist elements, the antisocialist elements— a phenomenon not so widespread and not on such a scale in our conditions—we say at once and openly: No, we will not allow anyone to act against socialism. Everything will be done to strengthen socialism. In my opinion, it is all clear.

If anyone makes plans in the hope that a fundamental, social, and political change will take place in the Soviet Union today, or somewhat later as a result of democracy and restructuring, these expectations are in vain. Involved here is not what kind of leadership is here, radical or less radical, revolutionary or less revolutionary. No. Ninety per cent of our people were born and grew up under socialism. They will not renounce that. Look how they follow the progress of glasnost and process of democracy—you probably have been reading about how they ensure individual activities do not lead to acquisitiveness and private-ownership psychology, that the cooperatives do not lead to self-seeking attitudes and exploiting the working class through high cooperative prices for cooperative products. They do not want to see those who dislike and are unsympathetic to socialism use our democratic process in order to smear socialism and impede the processes of democracy—and that happens.

In the same way we struggle against those who want to impede democracy because it hits the privileges the person has acquired and those have a habit of retaining power to order the people around. It is a very complex, profound process being joined by the party and all society. Our whole society will be recooked in this powerful cauldron of restructuring and will acquire new qualities, on a truly human scale, in the interests of working people— the principal yardstick of restructuring.

These are our plans. The rest are simply details. Is everything going well here? Far from well. Is everything turning out easily and simply? No. People often ask whether restructuring [perestroyka] is a political stand, whether there is political opposition among Gorbachev's leadership. No political stands exist in the Soviet Union. The opposition and braking mechanism lie within ourselves. I do not even exclude myself, although I am one of those who is more resolutely inclined to favor restructuring [perestroyka]. To be objective, it is the workers who are resolutely inclined to favor restructuring [perestroyka]. They urge us on strongly. They keep a check on that process and on the position of the leadership at all times. At all times an impulse reaches us, telling us not to draw back, not to slow down, not to stop, to keep moving forward, no matter how difficult it might be; therefore, the most revolutionary mood in restructuring [perestroyka] is among the people, the working class.

The strength of our policy lies in this. If we were to put forward a policy to which the people, above all the working class, did not react, it would be doomed to failure— wishful thinking. It may be wrapped in the best possible propagandistic wrapping. Nowadays the art of rhetoric is making rapid progress. Frequently the only aim is to conceal the truth and not to reveal it honestly. No rhetoric, no screen, no cunning political trick, can fool the people: The people are on the side of restructuring [perestroyka]. This is the decisive guarantee. We often think: Why did earlier processes to improve Soviet society came to nought at some stage? Soviet society always progressed, but it could have come out on a higher level in social, political, cultural, and scientific and technical progress.

Why have major initiatives come abrupty to an end? This happened both in the pre-war and postwar periods, especially after the 20th congress. Many efforts were made but were not seen through to the end. They were

half-hearted. One must learn certain lessons from history. Our main lesson is that all attempts to reform the political, economic, and social spheres were not bolstered by a developing democracy in the country, by the inclusion of the working people, through the mechanisms of democracy, into these processes. After all, this too is socialism. Under this social system, the working people must always be the main protagonist. When these initiatives, reforms, plans, and programs were not bolstered by a deepening development of democracy, they became bogged down. That is why we are paying so much attention to the processes of glasnost and democracy. Restructuring [perestroyka] without democracy and glasnost is doomed to failure. At the center of this platform is the main idea we have forumulated: More socialism. Everything has to be restructured on the principles of socialism: More democracy. Everything must be done with the people's participation. That is our plan.

With this I end my explanation of restructuring [perestroyka] and how we understand it. Everything else is simply the manifestation, the transformation, of these idea into different realms. Some things can be more successful in our country; some things, less successful. Some will proceed more quickly and some, more slowly. This is already a matter of struggle.

We have begun the initiative to restructure the party; we feel the party should lead these processes because it formulated the policy of restructuring and created the political and moral atmosphere in society, through the processes of glasnost and democracy to reinforce restructuring. The party, at the stage of implementing restructuring, will now do everything it can for this process to proceed.

You will say: But does everyone understand deeply, have they sensed its essence, and has everyone gotten involved actively in restructuring? No— this is a process. I can only say that restructuring is gaining momentum.

I am reviewing what you asked me to talk about, the new thinking and our foreign policy initiatives. You already know a great deal about them, which makes this part of my conversation with you easier. Hence I want to talk about our plans and our view of today's world. This lies at the basis of all initiatives of a personal nature but which, taken together, give an idea about our vision of the world and our approaches to world politics.

We have reached a point in the development of the world situation to a stage in which new approaches are needed. Misfortune and failures in foreign policies, crisis, tension, and confrontations are linked with the fact that we are trying to resolve new matters with the approaches of the 1940's and the 1930's—from imperial stances, when a group of countries had empires and pursued their foreign policies accordingly. A group of countries tried to use their military and economic superiority to carry out their foreign policy from a position of stength—both military and economic.

If we look for answers to the new questions in the speeches of Churchill and Truman—I have in mind the well-known, sadly notorious Fulton speech by Churchill, for example, or Truman's—made later on, not far removed from the present, nothing will come of this.

Time must not be wasted. The nuclear threat has become real. War must be ruled out as a means of solving political issues. The Clausewitz dictum that war is a continuation of politics in a different form no longer applies. This has been ruled out because any war today would turn into a nuclear war with the obvious consequences.

The problems of ecology have seized our attention. Cooperation is needed. A plundering of immense resources exists on all continents. In addition, in the developed countries, other ecological problems have arisen, and cooperation is essential.

Finally, look at scientific-technical progress: It has brought all peoples and all countries closer together. Tremendous structural changes with immense social consequences are taking place, and with political consequences. This requires common understanding and cooperation. The list of new problems and realities compels us to seek new approaches in building international relations, requiring new thinking. We believe that we have taken a step toward this, not only in the sense of philosophy, politics, and proclamations but in the sense of concrete steps and initiatives that show we are moving away from philosophy, statements, and declarations toward real policy in external affairs, toward building a world on the principles of a new thinking.

The first reaction in the world to our statements— that we live in a contradictory but interconnected and integral world requiring us to move toward a new thinking—was this: Utopia! A new leadership has arrived in the Soviet Union, inexperienced in politics, and it has new blood and has gone the way of the French and British Utopians. I could never be scornful even toward the French and British Utopians. They enriched humanitarian thought and the politics of mankind and continue to play their progressive role. That is not the point; we are not proposing utopia but a real philosophy and real initiatives.

I believe this policy will develop because the people are tired of tension, the burden of militarization and confrontation. Not adults alone but even the children of our population are worried. Politicians have established institutes to analyze the new Soviet proposals, and they continue to study them primarily to ask whether they

undermine their interests. They began to feel, through their own common sense and natural flair, that a foreign policy based on a new thinking is currently needed in the world today.

I am convinced that however difficult it may be, we must follow that path. How will we build international relations? In the interests of Britain, of the Soviet Union alone, of France or the United States of America? No, that won't produce international peace or international cooperation. We need a balance of interests and so must must move toward cooperation, forgoing some things. In the final resort, we will win from putting aside our strength, from a (?general redistribution) of all this. This is a difficult process because—let's be frank— it is only for uneducated people that one can tell fairy tales on these subjects, not for those who have a certain sum of knowledge.

The developing world— are not the relations of the developed countries, which include France, on an unequal footing? Cheap labor is used through the transnational compnies and is paid five to ten times less for the same work than is paid in the metropolitan country, plus the cheap natural resources. Thanks to this, capitalism keeps its advantage in the metropolitan countries, maintaining the living standards of its workers and attempting to show them the credit for this goes to it. But if it gets these results and a certain standard [as heard] in the metropolitan country, while starvation, disease and poverty exist in the territories of continents where 2.5 billion people live, I ask you: Can that be normal?

On the other hand, resources exist in one place but none exist in another. For example, there is not much oil in France and in other countries. The new way of thinking Gorbachev preaches—does it mean destroying all the world's economic links? What a risky venture, were it to happen. It would be adventurism. No, but they [as heard] need to be improved, hand in hand with disarmament, where huge resources are channelled by many, particularly developed, countries. Then disarmament and development assume real dimensions.

We have good relations and a good dialogue with Mr Mitterrand. I value this dialogue. He is an important political figure in the modern world.

This is the new way of thinking, and when you transform it into life—it raises many strata, many questions. Yet we have the possibility—through scientific and technical progress, through the new economic order, through a policy of meeting others halfway rather than being selfish, through compromises, and through common interest— to find solutions. Otherwise, the solutions will be found in another way. You know which way. When this shatters the whole world, we will quickly begin to understand.

How much effort was there from various sides to stop fascism in the pre-war period? They failed to reach agreement. You and I know the result. But after that, they did reach agreement—the Soviet Union, Britain, France and the United States—and they defeated that [pauses] monster. It does not always have to be that way— to recognize a phenomenon before we are shaken to the core, when millions of victims already exist before we start to figure things out better. This is our new thinking.

You are concerned by questions relating to the complex process of disarmament. How will the process go? We ascribe enormous importance to this complex of world problems. This question is of first-ranking importance. Yes, regional problems exist. Yes, there are important economic, ecological problems. You cannot get away from them or brush them aside, which would be the easiest but least responsible policy. There is the threat of nuclear war, a danger which we feel, and which everyone now feels: That it can happen irrespective of political decisions and on the basis of the adoption of political (?decisions). It can break out with completely uncontroll[illegible] build-up of nuclear weapons, which is why disarmament must be tackled.

When we proposed the 15-year program for eliminating nuclear weapons, we were proceeding from several positions of principle. First, security can only be equal. Attempts to outsmart each other and to strive to achieve superiority are fraught with grave consequences. That is impermissible now. I said to Mr Reagan, both in Geneva and in Rejkyavik: We do not want less security for the United States for the simple reason that it does not benefit us. The U.S. Administration would worry and find ways to solve the problem, thereby violating political stability. No trust or process of trust would exist.

We want equal security, both for ourselves and for the United States. We are counting on such an understanding from your side as well. While resolving issues with the United States, we never forget the interests and security of other peoples, above all, the peoples of Europe. We are very punctual and scrupulous in all that concerns our policy toward the peoples of Europe. We live here. We are connected through the ages, and we plan to live together and cooperate with those peoples. I talked about this in detail in parliament, with your help, in France, about our European home.

If you read the statement of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee of January last year you will see the problem of European security is examined in addition to the process between us and the United States on nuclear disarmament. The problem of conventional weapons, chemical weapons, and arms—and the number of troops—is always present there. It is envisaged there—it is calculated—so the balance is maintained at each stage, equal security, so nobody feels himself threatened. We are convinced supporters of that approach. We will act in that way.

With that I remove several of the issues and remarks expressed here. We are ready to discuss all issues and to cooperate in all areas. We persistently advance the idea of expanding cooperation in the humanitarian sphere; moreover, this was stipulated within the framework of the Helsinki process.

In that process much is out of place. That process is being used to push through what is unacceptable in another society and country, through the channels of exchange, contacts. One must proceed from the original and main principles and respect the choice of each people— the people's political and social choice. If we, friends, approach from different positions, nothing will come of our relations. We trust the choice of the French people. It is their business what sort of government to have. To begin with, it was socialist, on the basis of a bloc of left wing forces. Then it was socialist alone. Now the government represents certain forces; the president represents others. That is France's business.

We will deal with France the way it is. Why should we have a chauvinistic approach toward France? Not trust the people of France? They are a people who have contributed much to political culture, the general culture of mankind, and to progress. We trust France's choice and will cooperate with the existing government. We respect those values respected by the people themselves. That is the business of the French people.

We are entitled, however, to tell the French side we expect our values and our choice to be respected. It would be impermissible...[incomplete sentence as heard] In our friendly atmosphere of frankness, state one opinion regarding the atmosphere in France vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. We made our choice 70 years ago. We are following this road. We have made immense advances accompanied by immense losses, major mistakes. We realize them and are learning. We are drawing conclusions and want to make our society better. This is our affair, our struggle. When, through humanitarian contacts, they want to slip in values here unacceptable to us, we reject this as interference in our affairs.

May every people profess its ideology, everyone confess his own ideology, his own creed—I am replying to your question—what government to have, what political institutions, what code of morals: This is a matter for a people itself and the society in question.

Further immense possibilities open up. Our practical experience of cooperation between France and the Soviet Union is a very convincing example of the fact that...[Gorbachev changes thought] from the example of a long period we have seen for ourselves how we can fruitfully cooperate in the humanitarian sphere with respect, culture, and choice.

That is why we have proposed: Let us gather for a conference on humanitarian problems in Moscow. We, too, have something to tell the world on this score. We hope the French side will support the idea. Private, personal problems, relating to family matters, and other problems exist in the humanitarian realm . We are trying to solve them and will solve them.

In regard to people leaving, we have only one restriction on this score: If a person was connected with state secrets and his departure can cause harm to state security, we offer the opportunity for the secrets to which a person has access to become out of date. After some time, they leave.

To present it as it is sometimes presented— that in the Soviet Union, Jews and other ethnic groups are in a difficult position, and the prisons of the Soviet Union are filled to bursting with people there for their political views—is completely alien.

I said in reply to questions from correspondents—before my visit to France—from French radio and television, when they said: Is it true that you have 4 million people inside for political...[incomplete sentence as heard] In the first place we do not have that many prisons. If they are inside for their political convictions which do not agree with socialism, then it is inside their apartments; they are working at socialist enterprises and enjoy all the benefits of socialism. That is a fact— even if they do not agree with socialsim.

I am approaching a theme to which I should like to draw your attention. The bourgeois press of France, like no other in the past and especially now when changes are going on in the Soviet Union, speaks from the very hardest anti-Soviet standpoints in France. Then we are surprised questions arise among the French about the Soviet Union! If someone is told from day to day, from hour to hour, the same thing, he starts thinking it is true. I said that to Mr Mitterrand and I to Mr Chirac: We are surprised, we are surprised. We value highly the political dialogue with the leadership of France. We value our ancient, good relations imbued with human feelings, between our peoples. We do not understand this atmosphere cultivated in the French public about the Soviet Union. We are surprised at it. I reasoned: What's it all about? It cannot be the French people are so anti-Soviet. After all, many French people stay in our country and know the real picture of relations,

The process of our relations with France: What is it all about? The internal political struggle is affecting the standpoints in the press. The bourgeois press wants either to remain silent or to distort the picture of the processes taking place in the socialist Soviet Union, thereby weakening the influence, and primarly the understanding, of the potential of socialism for self-development and self-perfection. After all, socialism had been put on the rubbish-heap of history and, it turns out, is capable of developing and gaining strength. This is probably the root cause. This is your business, but we

must take account of the situation. This is what I am saying to the representatives of France, representing the whole spectrum, or views, of France.

For Soviet people this is a cause for...[incomplete sentence as heard]

We have now stopped jamming the radio, which comes in a stream of Russian. People hear this, and it is a cause for surprise: What is happening to the French? I think this is happening not to the French but to those who control the press, that selfsame independent, completely free, bourgeois press.

That is the humanitarian sphere. Will the new thinking be strengthened? Will cooperation expand? Will trust be born? Will these accretions be removed? We are realists, we are patient, and we will not give up our policy of cooperating with France. We count on the same kind of reaction from the politicians; we believe in the French people.

There are questions I will cover in my address, or addresses, to be made in connection with the jubilee, the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution. I will give the answers to some questions you put to me—I am reserving the opportunity to answer them—later on, during these speeches. I am now working on a report.

By the way, my vacation was very fruitful. I managed to do a lot during my leave. I didn't step 100 meters past the doors of the place where I was staying. I was fully occupied with thinking over our affairs, our situation, our business for today and tomorrow, and among all I was working on certain problems to be thought over, including the report about the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution. Much of what I have told you will be in it: And a few things I haven't told you as well. [chuckles]

Thank you for the meeting. I was very happy, truly happy, not only in a political sense but in a human way to meet with representatives of France. I wish your mission—of which I have a high opinion—will be successfully completed. Thank you for your attention. [applause]

Discussion With Participants

PM301101 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Sep 87 Second Edition pp 1-2

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev's Meeting With Representatives of the French Public"]

[Text] General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev met with a large group of representatives of the French public ("Initiative-87") in the Kremlin's Sverdlov Hall 29 September.

The group consists of some 360 prominent French politicians and public figures and includes representatives of virtually all the main political forces and parties of France, deputies of the National Assembly, senators, mayors, people prominent in culture and art, scientists, workers, office employees, Catholic priests, engineers, businessmen, doctors, lawyers, journalists.

The visit was organized on the initiative of the France-USSR Society and the Soviet Association of Friendship societies; the group includes many officials and activists of the France-USSR Society. The trip was timed to coincide with the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution and provides for acquaintance with the life of the Soviet people, the policy of the CPSU at the present stage and the main aims and first results of restructuring (perestroika).

Mikhail Gorbachev: Until recently plenary meetings of the party's Central Committee were held in this hall, formerly Yekaterininskiy and now Sverdlov Hall of the Kremlin. Still earlier, meetings of the All-Union Central Executive Committee were held here. This hall is the scene of such major political and cultural functions as the presentation of state prizes, meetings with representatives of culture, the working class and the peasantry. So this hall has heard a lot and witnessed many events. I am happy to welcome you, representatives of France, a friendly country, here in this hall. Since I am familiar with those who are present I can say that in your person I greet France, the French people. (applause)

Present here are representatives of the entire political spectrum of France. It turned out that the visit to the Soviet Union has helped everybody to come to terms. If this experience is applied to domestic affairs, then matters will quickly improve in France. (animation in the hall)

So far I cannot discern where the opposition is, both in the left and the right, and also the center. Perhaps all this will surface later, in the course of the conversation. So let us wait and see.

I suggest that the guests take the floor.

Madeleine Gilbert, executive president of the France-USSR Society: Mr General Secretary, during your official visit to Paris in October 1985 you honored us by meeting with the leadership of the France-USSR Society. Back then you spoke about the activity of our society and said that most diverse flows of intellectual thinking could be found in it. You emphasized the common desire of all members of the society to ensure a more durable peace and develop friendship between the Soviet and French people on the basis of the diversification of efforts. We are trying to do everything to promote in France a better knowledge of such a great country as the Soviet Union.

Mr General Secretary, you must be aware that today, two years after the meeting, we again have the opportunity to discuss matters related to the life of our two countries. Our trip came to be known as 'Initiative-87' because of the initiative taken by our organization in 1987. All 365 people taking part in the current trip are in front of you. I would like to emphasize particularly the diverse character of the political and philosophic tendencies, professionals and experts in various fields represented here. This diversity is indicative. It attests to the growing attention in our country to the processes of paramount importance taking place in the Soviet Union. Notable also is the interest evoked by the Soviet initiatives in the sphere of peace and disarmament.

We are grateful to you for receiving us on the second day of our tour, right after your return from holiday. We believe that this is indicative of your interest in France. As citizens of France we are very pleased with that.

Jean Sauvagnargues, former minister of foreign affairs: Mr General Secretary, the people taking part in that fact-finding tour are well aware of its importance. We are satisfied with the honor you accorded us, representatives of 52 departments, by receiving us here in the Kremlin, within these walls that have witnessed many solemn occasions. The level and heterogeneous character of our group reflect the immense interest evoked in our country by the process of change and renovation of economic structures which you have started.

In the remaining years of this century the tendency toward solidarity and interdependence is increasingly making itself felt. Everyone considers themselves to be involved in the affairs of a country; hence, the attention and expectant interest in yours. I must say that the reception accorded us and an exceptional quality of the exchange of views we had with our Soviet interlocutors allow us to say that our expectations have been fulfilled and that our curiosity was satisfied.

Franco-Soviet friendship has many years behind it. There were different periods, but General de Gaulle imparted stability to these relations, as well as to East-West relations on the whole. He saw three main directions in them: detente, concord and cooperation. These words are the slogan of Franco-Soviet friendship today as well. Our friendship rests on the need to preserve peace and ensure security and global balance within the framework of the choice which each of us has made by participating in its own alliance.

The dialogue which we are starting here can help improve understanding, develop cooperation in all spheres, and extend and multiply contacts between people. All this will provide for us a better, more stable and durable future, and solidarity of all. I think that all this fits into the course proclaimed by General de Gaulle and which was followed by many of his successors.

Pierre Mauroy, former prime minister: Mr. General Secretary, I would like to say that it is a great honour for me to be present at this conversation, to hear, see and greet you. First, I would like to say a few words as a citizen of France. We are extremely glad that you receive us exactly in this way. This is a message to France, taking up the idea set forth twenty years ago by General de Gaulle during his visit to Moscow which dealt with cooperation.

One should also mention your visit to Paris followed by Mr Mitterrand's visit to Moscow. Thus, the point at issue is the striving to strengthen ties between France and your country. These ties are traditional. France, abiding by its allied obligations, pursues an independent policy.

Mr. General Secretary, I do not forget that I held the post of prime miniser from 1981 to 1984. I frequently came to Moscow in complex periods. In November 1982, in particular, we discussed wishes, the striving for detente, cooperation and peace. The world was unstable, clouds were hanging over it. But years have passed and now the present day has dawned. The hour of disarmament, the hour of peace has struck thanks to you, Mr General Secretary. (applause)

Thanks to the agreement which you will conclude with the President of the United States, thanks to the support which will be given you, you will satisfy the aspirations of the popular masses, of people striving for peace. But not only in the name of peace but also in the name of cooperation, peace in the name of development and progress, in the name of overcoming the present crisis. This is a challenging task and the road is thorny, but you have found the courage to embark on this road.

Of course, peace will not come of itself, peace must be earned. In this connection one should mention agreements which could have been broader. They could have applied also to conventional armaments and to chemical weapons. Why not return to the idea expressed by Zores about the need of a simultaneous, verifiable and universal disarmament? It is desirable to advance along this road. At every stage, I believe, each side should have its share of security. This applies to France, the Soviet Union, and the United States, and to Europe as well.

May I dwell on questions related to both socialism and communism? I am speaking as the mayor of Lille where the international was performed for the first time.

Years have passed since the end of the 19th century. Decades have already passed since 1917. Both socialism and communism are developing dialectically —the dialectics of life, development, survival, the dialectics of growth. I think the ideas of socialism are inseparable from the idea of equality and freedom. The same can be said also of communism. I believe that thanks to you a new era is beginning, an era of dialogue, greater openness, glasnost. We all take this close to heart.

We arrived here on Sunday and to a certain extent have already felt the changes taking place here. On this road I want to personally wish you success, to your ideas and to your country.

Your stay away on vacation gave rise to all sorts of rumours. But they only point out the importance of the work you are doing.

Mikhail Gorbachev: It was thought that I was on vacation longer than normal. So let me tell you officially that I was on leave from August 24 to September 24.

Joseph Rozier, bishop of Poitiers: Mr General Secretary, as a Catholic bishop, I would wish to remind you, if I may, that on September 29 the Church celebrates St. Michael's Day. In this connection permit me to wholeheartedly congratulate you for your namesake day and shake your hand.

I do not represent here the bishops of France and Rome. I am speaking here simply as a priest who was invited to take part in "Initiative-87." As a Frenchman I stand firmly with my country, my people, with the feelings that we experience as we take part in discussing here the great problems of mankind. As a man of the Church I feel solidarity with Catholics, with other Christians, and with members of other religions who belong to our delegation.

The belief in Jesus Christ, in the Gospel of Love is for us a powerful stimulus for the advancement of the ideas of peace, and recognition of human rights.

We think that the keys to many problems associated with peace and freedom are in your hands. The efforts underway in this direction under your influence make many people hopeful for the happiness of all those who are suffering because they are still denied the right to life, to creed, to the free choice of country. Happiness, peace, and freedom in the world require that these efforts of yours continue and bear fruit.

I recall Pope John Paul II saying on the day of his election: "Do not be afraid, do not fear, open the boundaries to Christ". To our joy, the doors have opened here for us, Mr General Secretary, and we thank you wholeheartedly for that; we thank you on behalf of those who yearn for fear, apprehensions, obstacles and oppression to disappear, who want openness and brotherhood to triumph. I wish you a happy namesake-day. I congratulate you. (Applause)

Roland Leroy, member of the Political Bureau of the French Communist Party, deputy of the National Assembly: Mr General Secretary, it is difficult to be the fourth speaker on the list. We are pluralists, but we frequently repeat ourselves in our ideas.

Mikhail Gorbachev: If pluralism develops such a phenomenon as repetition, this means that you have something in common which unites you. (Applause)

Roland Leroy: During the February 4, 1986, conversation when you gave an interview to the *L'Humanite* newspaper, you spoke about the processes which were unfolding in the Soviet Union. I told you that this is a real revolution. You replied, however, that the revolution had already taken place in 1917, that what you had in mind was the acceleration of the process which it started. Since then, and these words reflect reality, you speak about a revolutionary process, about a revolution. We in France follow with keen interest everything that is happening in your country.

The meetings and conversations which started during our stay — and will continue — allow us to conclude that the Soviet people express their ideas freely. We take note of this and see in their words different approaches. It seems quite natural to us.

There is a certain struggle behind any differences; in France we are accustomed to this. Here as well we witness a keen struggle, happening before our eyes. We are closely following it, listening to your calls for democratization and wider citizen participation in public life. We note your good will aimed at more fully implementing human rights. We would like to hear from you what perestroika means for each Soviet citizen. We are amazed by the changes which are taking place in the field of the mass media. We believe that Soviet society today tolerates ever more openly pluralism of opi on different issues. We like it.

Mikhail Gorbachev: That's right, but to the word pluralism we add only one adjective — socialist pluralism. This means that our democracy, our pluralism, is based on our socialist values.

Roland Leroy: You may rest assured that we are aware of that. We do not separate the processes taking place in your country from the essence of socialism.

In about one year's time we will observe the 200th anniversary of the great French Revolution. In all periods of history we have always pointed out that the struggle of the working people, the struggle of the people for social gains, is playing the decisive role. This has been the case throughout the history of France.

Mikhail Gorbachev: If we start looking for the roots of our restructuring drive we may go back to the French Revolution and then to the Commune of Paris. Generally speaking, we are linked with France very firmly. Our cultures and experiences have been enriching each other for centuries rather than decades. I'm saying this not to make a pleasant gesture because the representatives of France, of the French people, are in this hall. I'm simply stating what is actually true.

Roland Leroy: During the conversation to which I've just referred you emphasized the need for ridding Europe of nuclear weapons, primarily, of medium-range missiles. Now you are going to sign an agreement with

the United States on that matter. This is an important step forward. Many people in our country where somehow uneasy at the prospect of the conclusion of that agreement. Some kind of anachronism could be observed in such an attitude. In the final analysis, the advance toward disarmament, toward peace, should be supported not only by words. It is important to take permanent actions which would come in line with the cause of creating a world without weapons, without wars. (applause)

Mikhail Gorbachev: This time the applause is more expressive. There is more of it deeper in the audience and less of it in the front rows. Pluralism begins to work. (laughter)

Roland Leroy: When General de Gaulle arrived in Moscow in 1944 he said "History shows that when France and Russia are disunited, this is a misfortune for Europe.".

Mikhail Gorbachev: We recall this statement by De Gaulle.

Roland Leroy: We act within the framework of the France-USSR Society in the name of cooperation, learning of your country's life, friendship, and peace.

Pierre Pineau, deputy mayor of Bordeaux: Mr General Secretary, like myself, those who are committed to the policy, example and ideas of General de Gaulle are now under the impression of this meeting. I spoke with Prime Minister Jacques Chirac, and often conversed with Jacques Chaban-Delmas, president of the National Assembly, and the mayor of Bordeaux, whose deputy I am. We all are attentive to the novelties which you introduce to the life of this vast country and to the transformations which we observe in their entirety.

Your country intends to sign an agreement with the United States. It does not involve France but the cause of disarmament meets our wishes. Disarmament which applies to all categories of weapons leads to genuine balance. We live on one and the same continent, and we shall go on living here. Therefore we should improve relations, develop economic and cultural ties and cooperation, and more widely spread ideas and contacts between people in the name of human rights.

The reforms which you effect facilitate the process. We ardently wish the process to be a success. It was precisely in this spirit that we responded to the invitation of the France-USSR Society to participate in "Initiative-87."

Mikhail Gorbachev: The list of speakers is over, but maybe there still are people who would like to take the floor?

A number of French participants in the meeting in their brief speeches asked Mikhail Gorbachev a number of questions concerning various aspects of the internal and foreign policy of the CPSU.

Mikhail Gorbachev: Friends, I would like once again to welcome the initiative of the France-USSR Society which you call "Initiative-87." I want to do this not only because of politeness and hospitality, but also to emphasize the great political meaning of this initiative.

Looking at the present-day world, I would say that concern is characteristic of it, concern over a direction in which the world is going or, to be more exact, what will be the direction in which the world, now at a cross-roads, will go? Will it go along the road of further confrontation and tension or along the road of a search, even if difficult, for peace, cooperation, and mutual understanding?

Modern imperatives are such that not only politicians, and not so much politicians, will be further determining the direction of world processes concerning mankind's survival and preservation. Surely the voice of the public, of world public opinion, of various political forces irrespective of their class content, will sound increasingly louder with every passing day, with every stage.

In this sense I regard the "Initiative-87" as a big political initiative deserving support. We view it as a desire to join in the search for ways to mutual understanding, cooperation, the development of relations, a considerate attitude to one another, and to a change of the entire atmosphere. Those changes could afterwards transform into a policy, too, and thereby ensure a new character and type of international relations.

The whole tradition of our foreign policy stems from Lenin. This is people's diplomacy. When we are accused of propaganda, I cannot agree with that. it is something different if some of our steps, our appeals to the peoples, to public opinion, produce some propaganda effect. We proceed from realities, from the fact that a new type of international relations cannot be built now without the involvement of public forces, the peoples themselves.

The politicians who will take this into account will receive the support of the peoples. On the contrary, those who ignore the opinion of the masses or engage in politicking, and politicking always involves deceit, will be shortlived politically. I am deeply confident of that.

It is from these positions that I perceive your "Initiative-87." I think this is a good example to all countries, to the public of other countries, including the Soviet Union. I feel in this initiative the mood of the French people. This is the main thing.

I was very glad to hear what was said here, as I understand, on behalf of the whole delegation, and on its instruction by Madeleine Guilbert, executive president

of the France-USSR Society whom we already know. Her contribution to Soviet-French friendship is highly appreciated in the Soviet Union. The statements by all the other participants in the meeting were also interesting and pithy. They voiced the desire to understand what is taking place in the Soviet Union, our intentions and plans both in home policy and in international affairs. I also heard words of support for our efforts in both directions. I thank you for that.

Recently I have finished a book on perestroika and new thinking. It sums up to some degree all that has been thought over, undertaken and made in these years. It also deals with plans for the future.

In a short preface to the reader I said that we, the Soviet leadership and the Soviet people, want to be correctly understood by all nations, Europeans in particular. They are our natural neighbours. We have a common history with them, a common fate and, hopefully, a common happy future in our European home. We want to be correctly understood in our plans concerning the restructuring, new thinking, and our foreign policy. We appreciate when the French representatives speak here with understanding about our domestic and foreign policy, even with sympathy, solidarity and support from the whole pluralistic complex which is present here.

Here I am going over to the next theme which you are interested in and want to understand better before returning to France — perestroyka.

Perestroyka is our internal matter, born out of internal demands of our country. It is not an invention or some fancy idea which crossed the mind of a group of people who, all of a sudden, decided that some perestroyka was needed. No, life itself led us to perestroyka.

You already know a lot; you heard a lot and will hear even more. I do not want to dwell upon the details of perestroyka. I want to let you into our plans. This will be shorter and, maybe, more convincing.

We take pride in our history; we take pride in our revolution the way France takes pride in its own, French revolution. With France we take pride in the French revolution. It was an immense contribution to the history of the French people. The October Revolution made it possible to take our country from the difficult situation in which it found itself at the beginning of the 20th century. Over the 70 years we have traversed a long road. It is precisely due to the revolution, due to the fact that the choice was made in favor of socialism, that the Soviet Union has become the country you see today. It is a modern state which has immense achievements. It is a society possessing a huge political, intellectual, scientific and natural potential. But it is a society which has many problems. There are problems in the political process, in the development of our democracy. There are problems in the social sphere and in the economy. Problems also exist in the spiritual sphere, in the sphere of moral philosophy and morality. Restructuring is called upon to resolve and remove the problems and contradictions that have accumulated, to enable socialism to develop a second wind — for the good of the people and on the basis of the socialist values.

We are not being cunning either with our own people or with the people in other countries. We continue developing and strengthening socialism. We shall be modernising the economy on the basis of socialist principles. We shall be developing the process of democracy on the basis of socialist principles. We shall preserve social protection of our people, a characteristic of socialist society.

Today we are not satisfied either with the level of the country's development or with the situation in the country. We want to improve society in all respects. However, even today a Soviet citizen is well protected socially. His right to work is guaranteed. He has access to housing, although there are a lot of problems here. It should be borne in mind that housing is free or inexpensive. Education, secondary and higher, is free, as is health care. This is what creates social guarantees and ensures man's confidence.

The principle of socialism — from each according to his abilities, to each according to his work — operates on the basis of these guarantees. For the time being we are unable to provide what the future society — communism — will provide: To each according to his needs. Hence, there can be only one criterion — according to one's work, one's talent, one's contribution to the development of the country's economy. These principles have been tested by our experience and they are working.

We are not giving up on socialism; we want to make it better. Therefore we say: more socialism. We are not giving up our democracy. But we are speaking about using the possibilities of exactly socialist democracy.

The distinctive feature of socialist democracy is, above all, that it ensures the decisive say of working people, of the demos, the people. Well, this is insufficient now, we believe. Therefore we are unfolding processes of democracy, openness, such processes that would embrace both the party and the political system as a whole, the public organisations and the economy. We want the working people at the enterprise to feel themselves the real masters, that they are to elect the managers, starting from the foreman to the enterprise director. We want them, on having formed a council, to decide questions of planning, determine prospects of their development, participate in the distribution of profits, and resolve social issues. This is how we intend to advance the process of democracy, to deepen and broaden it.

When the question is asked about the limits of the reconstruction drive, about the limits of public openness, the limits of democracy within the framework of the process which we are unfolding, we say: All that

strengthens socialism, including public openness, democracy, should be supported and welcomed. But exactly all that strengthens socialism. But if — and we are already encountering this — somebody in the country or beyond it wants to use our openness and glasnost to instigate extremist elements, anti-socialist elements, and there are such elements, though this phenomenon is not so widespread, we instantly say openly: No, we shall allow nobody to act against socialism. Everything will be done for socialism to strengthen. Those who hope for democracy and reconstruction to lead to a social and political turnabout in the Soviet Union are mistaken. Such expectations are in vain and the matter here is not what leadership we have — radical or less radical, revolutionary or less revolutionary. Ninety percent of our people were born and grew up under socialism. They shall not waive its gains. Look how they are following the assertion of openness, the unfolding of the process of democracy. Look at how they are trying to see to it that individual activity should not lead to a hoarding mentality, to private-owner psychology, that the spread of cooperatives should not lead to grubbing habits, to stripping the working class through high prices of cooperative products. They do not want those who dislike socialism to use the democratic process to smear our system. We are encountering such attempts. We are struggling against them, just as against those who would like to put a brake on democracy, since it affects the privileges which they unjustly assumed; those who are accustomed to holding power and commanding the people.

Reorganization is a very complex and deep process which the party, the entire society and all its sections have joined in. The whole of our society will undergo changes in the powerful crucible of the reorganization and will acquire a new quality in truly human dimension, in the interests of the working people.

The working people's interests are the main criterion of the entire reorganization process. Such are our plans; all the rest are details. Is everything successful in this country in this respect? Not at all everything is such. Is everything proceeding so easily and simply? No, it is not. It is often asked: Is there political opposition to the reorganization process? There is no political opposition in the Soviet Union.

Opposition and brakes and the very mechanism of braking are within ourselves. I do not exclude myself. The working people and the working class are fully and resolutely in favor of the reorganization. They urge us and urge vigorously. They monitor the process and the attitude of the leadership all the time. The following impulse reaches us all the time: Not to retreat, and not to slow down, not to stop, to proceed ahead however difficult it would be. The people, the workers, and the working class have the most revolutionary attitude in the sphere of the reorganization. Herein is the strength of our policy.

If we suggested a policy which the people, particularly the working class, would not respond to, such a policy would be doomed to failure. Good wishes can be wrapped into the best propaganda packages — the art of rhetoric in our age progresses rapidly, quite often for only the purpose of concealing the truth, rather than revealing and honestly presenting it.

But no rhetoric, no political contrivances will deceive the people. The people are siding with the reorganization process. This is a decisive guarantee.

We think: Why is it that the processes of perfecting Soviet society were broken off earlier at some stages. All the time Soviet society has been progressing but it could have attained a higher level of social, political, cultural, scientific and technological progress.

Why did the initiatives, and big ones, too, get broken down? This is how it was in pre-war and post-war time, particularly since the 20th Congress of the Party. A good deal of effort was made at that time but those efforts were not carried through. They proved half-and-half ones. Why did it happen so? We are very much concerned with this question. History should be studied in order to draw certain lessons from it.

The chief lesson is that the processes which originated in the past and the attempts at reforms concerning political, economic and social spheres were not substantiated by the broadening and development of democracy, by drawing the entire society and the working people themselves into the processes through the mechanisms of democracy. This is the main cause of setbacks in the past.

Socialism is such a social system under which the working man should be the chief character. When the initiatives, reforms, plans, and programmes were not backed up by a further development and deepening of democracy, they petered out.

This is why we are so attentive to the processes of openness and democracy. Reorganization without democracy and openness is doomed to failure. The "more socialism, more democracy" formula expresses the essense of our platform. It embodies the main idea. More socialism means that everything should be done and reorganized on the principles of socialism. More democracy means that everything should be done with the participation of the people.

These are our plans. I now end my explanation of what perestroika is and how we understand it. The rest is only a manifestation of these plans in different fields. Maybe some things are done more successfully and some less so. Some things are done faster and some slower. This is already a question of struggle.

We have started perestroika on the initiative of the party and with the party. We believe that the party must spearhead this process. The party formulated the policy

of perestroika and created the political and moral atmosphere in society through openness and democracy. When it is time to implement perestroika the party will do everything to ensure the advance of this process. You might say: Does everyone understand and feel perestroika deeply enough; is everyone actively involved in perestroika? No, this is a process. I can only say that perestroika is gaining momentum.

You asked me to speak about the new thinking and our foreign policy initiatives. You are basically familiar with them, making my task easier. Here I also want to speak about our plans, our view of the present-day world, beacause it is this view that underlies our initiatives. Each of them taken separately is, so to say, an isolated case. But taken together they give an idea of our world outlook and our approaches to world politics.

I think that in the development of the world situation and in world processes we have approached a stage when new attitudes are needed. Any crisis phenomena, tension and situations of confrontation, in my view, are due to attempts to approach absolutely new problems on the basis of attitudes from the 1940's and even the 1930's, from imperial positions. At one time there was a group of countries which had their empires and pursued their foreign policy accordingly. There was a group of countries which tried to use military and economic superiority to pursue foreign policy from a position of strength. It is no use looking for answers to new questions in speeches by Churchill and Truman — I mean the notorious Fulton speech. Useless also are attempts to look for answers in the speeches by later-day politicians. There is no time to be wasted.

The nuclear threat has become a reality. War should be ruled out as a means for resolving political issues. Clausewitz's theory that war is a continuation of policy by other means no longer applies.

Problems of ecology have put a very firm grip on us. Cooperation is a must here. even today resources of the earth are being plundered on all continents. Finally, take scientific and technological progress. It has brought all peoples and countries closer together. Enormous structural changes are underway and they produce immense social and political consequences. Take information. Even today information media can be manipulated enough to complicate the situation in the world.

The list of new problems and new realities could be extended. They demand correct perception and cooperation. They are making us seek new approaches to the way international relations are built. This is why we are saying that a new thinking is a must. It is not a mere phrase either.

We have made a step toward the new thinking not only in the sense of philosophy, not only in the sense of proclaiming a policy, but also in the sense of concrete steps and initiatives. From philosophy, statements and declarations we are switching to a real policy in foreign affairs — to the construction of a world on the principles of new thinking.

The initial reaction in the world to all our statements that we are living in a contradictory yet interrelated and integral world and that, despite all contradictions, we should rise to the new thinking was as follows: A utopia. What you see, they used to say, is a new leadership with little experience in politics and it has followed the path of the French and English utopians.

By the way, I'm against a disrespectful attitude to the French and English utopians. They engendered creative ideas in humanitarian thinking, man's thinking and in politics. Their heritage continues playing its progressive role.

But that's another point. What we are offering is not a utopia. We are offering a realistic philosophy and realistic initiatives. I believe that such a policy will be forcefully making its way forward, primarily because nations are tired of tension, the burden of militarization, and confrontation. This is a matter that concerns not only adults, but also children. We have felt that.

Politicians, analyzing what the new Soviet initiatives mean and carry with them, do so primarily from this point of view: Will it not undermine their interests? As for peoples, they felt with their common sense and intuition that the policy based on new thinking was exactly what the present world needed.

Speaking of interests, is it possible to build international relations in the interests of Britain or in the interests of only the Soviet Union, France or the United States? No, there will be neither international peace nor international cooperation. A balance of interests is needed. This means that it is necessary to meet each other halfway, to make some concessions. We all stand to gain eventually. This is a difficult process.

The developing countries also have their interests which need to be taken into account. Today, relations between developed countries, where France belongs, and the developing world, are not equal. Cheap labor and cheap natural resources are used through transnationals. Capitalism is maneuvering and maintaining the standard of living of the working people. There is hunger, disease and poverty on continents populated by 2.5 billion people. I ask: Is this normal?

On the other hand, one state has resources while another does not. So, does the new thinking advocated by Gorbachev mean an undermining of all world economic ties? It would be a gamble. But the world economic ties need to be perfected, and in interrelationship with disarmament, which releases huge resources at that. The slogan "Disarmament for development" must attain real forms.

The new thinking, when translated into reality, gives an opportunity to raise many issues and questions. It enables us to find solutions through scientific and technological progress, through a new economic order, sensible rather than egotistical policy, and through compromises and mutual interest.

You are interested in questions related to the disarmament complex. We ourselves attach great, priority significance to this complex world issue. We believe that disarmament is a top priority issue. Yes, there are regional problems, economic and ecological problems and all of them are important. One cannot disassociate oneself from them, or brush them aside. But there is the threat of a nuclear war. This is the danger which we feel and, I believe, everybody feels now. A nuclear conflict can break out without any political solutions. Given the stockpiles of nuclear weapons, it can break out uncontrollably. Therefore, we need to stop the process of the arms race and get down to disarmament.

When we proposed the 15-year program for the elimination of nuclear weapons we worked from several basic premises. The first one is as follows: Security can be only equal. Efforts to outwit each other, to achieve superiority, are fraught with serious consequences. This is impermissible.

I told Mr Reagan both in Geneva and Reykjavik: We do not want the United States of America to feel less secure than the Soviet Union does. We would not stand to gain from such a situation, for it would be a continuing concern for the U.S. Administration. It would start seeking ways for tackling that problem and this would lead to a disruption of political stability. As a result there would be no trust at all. This is why we want equal security both for ourselves and for America. We hope you will understand why we formulate the question that way.

In precisely the same manner, we never forget the interests and security of other nations, including — naturally enough — all European nations, when we and America are tackling issues jointly. We are very punctual and scrupulous in everything as regards our policy with respect to European countries. We are living here, we have been linked for many centuries, we are going to live together with those nations in the future and cooperate with them. I dwelt in detail on that matter in the French Parliament. There, I spoke about our common European home. I discussed that matter in detail with your president. We have good relations and maintian a good dialogue with Mr Mitterrand. I value that dialogue. He is a major political figure in the contemporary world.

If you read the January 1986 statement by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee you will see that it considers in detail how the process of nuclear disarmament of the USSR and the United States should proceed. But the problem of European security is present there all the time. The statement touches upon problems of chemical weapons, the reduction of conventional armaments and the number of troops. Everything has been calculated in such a way as to preserve a balance and equal security at every stage, so that no one should feel threatened.

We are confident adherents to such an approach and we shall be acting this way.

We are prepared to cooperate in all spheres. We are persistently promoting the idea of cooperation in the humanitarian sphere in the spirit of what was agreed to within the framework of the Helsinki process. Now this process is sometimes used for pushing into other countries through the channels of exchanges and contacts, something that is unacceptable to them. We are confident that it is necessary to proceed from the fundamental and main principle — the political and social choice of every nation should be respected.

We trust the choice made by the French people. It is up to them which government to have. We shall do business with France the way it is. We shall cooperate with the French Government that exists there. Generally speaking, we respect the values which are respected by a people itself.

We have the right to say that we expect respect for our values and our choice. We made our choice 70 years ago and have been proceeding along our road. We have achieved a good deal, although we have also sustained tremendous losses and made big errors. We draw conclusions, learn, and want to make our society better. But this is our cause and our endeavour. When attempts are made to plant unacceptable (to us) values through humanitarian contacts, we reject that. We consider that interference in our affairs.

Let every people profess its own ideology and its beliefs. It is the affair of each people to decide what kind of government, political institutions, and morality it wants to have. If these principles are observed, vast possibilities for cooperation open up.

As far as the humanitarian sphere is concerned, we have suggested a gathering in Moscow for a conference on humanitarian issues. We have something to say on this score to the whole world. We hope that France will support this idea.

In the humanitarian sphere, there are private, personal problems pertaining to people's families and relatives, and other problems. We consider them, resolve them, and will continue to resolve them.

As far as departures from our country are concerned, we have just one obstacle and restriction on that score: If a person was connected with state secrets and if his departure may do certain damage to the security of the state. When the secrets get outdated, the person may leave.

Here I approach the subject to which I would like to draw your attention. The bourgeois press of France — like no other press in the Western world in the past and particularly now that such changes take place in the Soviet Union — acts from most rabid anti-Soviet positions.

It is no wonder that French people develop prejudices with regard to the Soviet Union. If a person is told one and the same thing day in and day out and every hour, he or she begins to believe that this is exactly so. I told Mr Mitterrand and Mr Chirac about this.

We appreciate the political dialogue with the leadership of France. We value kind relations imbued with human sentiments between our peoples. In this context we cannot understand the atmosphere which is cultivated in France with regard to the Soviet Union.

French people visit our country and know the truth about our life, about the Soviet people's attitude to the French people. What is the matter? Why does the French press stick to positions which are hostile to us? Apparently, the internal political struggle tells on its stand.

The bourgeois press now wants either to pass over in silence or distort the picture of the processes taking place in the socialist Soviet Union and to weaken the impact of socialist ideas, to prevent people from realizing that socialism has the ability for self-development and self-perfection.

Socialism was long ago consigned to the dust-heap of history but it turns out that it is capable of developing, and even gathers strength. This is, maybe, the root-cause of the matter. This is, of course, your concern, but we cannot but take into account the real situation. I'm telling this to you as representatives of France.

If the new thinking grows stronger and cooperation gains in scope, there will emerge confidence, and all these accretions will be removed. We are realists and we are patient. We shall not abandon our policy of cooperation with France, and we count on a similar reaction on its part. And we, of course, believe in the French people.

There are matters which I will cover in my speech or speeches which I will make on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. I will give answers to some of the questions which you asked me. I'm reserving, so to speak, the opportunity to answer you later during those speeches.

I'm now working on a report. Incidentally, my holiday was very fruitful. I have managed to do much. I did not even go 100 meters away from the grounds of the house where I lived. I was fully preoccupied with thinking the situation over, with thinking over our present-day and future actions, and worked on some problems, including a report on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution. Much of what I have told you will be in it. Something I did not tell you will be in it, too.

Thank you for the meeting. I was wholeheartedly gratified, not only from the political point of view but from a human one, too, to meet with representatives of France. I wish your mission, which I highly appreciate, to be completed successfully.

The meeting was attended by A.F. Dobrynin, V.V. Zagladin, A.G. Kovalyov, V.V. Tereshkova, and V.V. Karpov.

AFP Reports Meeting

AU291424 Paris AFP in English 1418 GMT 29 Sep 87

[Excerpts] Moscow, Sept 29 (AFP)—Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev appeared in public again Tuesday for the first time in 53 days and issued a strong warning against challenges to his authority.

Meeting 370 members of a visiting French delegation at the Kremlin, he banged his fist on the table to make the point that "there is no political opposition in the Soviet Union, no opposition to Gorbachev's leadership."

And he warned off anyone seeking to use his "glasnost" policy of openness for "extremist activities," adding that "the aspirations are vain of those who would like to see democratization as an opportunity for a political coup d'etat". [passage omitted]

The Soviet Communist Party General Secretary said that he had used his holiday to complete the editing of a book.

"The time off was fruitful. I was able to to do a lot of things, particularly prepare the report on the 70th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution."

"I did not feel like leaving the spot where I was taking my holiday," Mr. Gorbachev said.

"Your absence was noticed, but above all it underscores your presence," said former French premier Pierre Mauroy, one of the delegation on a visit here organized by a Franco-Soviet association.

Mr Mauroy hailed Mr Gorbachev as "the man of disarmament, the man of peace," and invited him to the northern French city of Lille, of which Mr Mauroy is the mayor, for the 100th anniversary of the first rendering of the communist hymn, the *Internationale* there.

Mr Gorbachev noted with laughter that another speech, by Roland Leroy, editor of the French communist party daily *L'Humanite*, had drawn less applause from other members of the delegation.

Mr Leroy had attacked the recent joint military maneuvers staged by France and West Germany and the planned establishment of a joint defense council by Paris and Bonn.

But Mr Gorbachev had harsh words for what he called the "bourgeois, anti-Soviet, and reactionary French press, so-called free and independent" which "conceals and distorts the innovations in the Soviet Union."

The Soviets were "anxious and alarmed" by this situation, Mr Gorbachev said, asserting that "anti-Sovietism is nowhere stronger than in France."

Another member of the French delegation, former Nazi concentration camp inmate Henri Bulawko, representing a French Jewish organization pleaded for better treatment for Jews in the Soviet Union.

Mr Bulawko said he owed a debt of gratitude to the Soviet Union, as he had been saved by Soviet troops who relieved the Auschwitz extermination camp where he was being held at the end of the Second World War. [passage omitted]

(Mr Mauroy, interviewed by French television and radio stations, said he had found the Soviet leader "on top of his form, very alert, extremely vivacious, tanned and slightly thinner."

(The two-hour meeting with the French delegation was "very relaxed" and "created an atmosphere which made it impossible to read prepared speeches," Mr Mauroy said.

(If there had been a secret about Mr Gorbachev's absence, "I was not able to fathom it," Mr Mauroy said, adding, "I wonder if he wanted after the agreement with the Americans (on abolishing medium-range nuclear missiles) to show that his authority was solid, and perhaps to consolidate it.")

Dobrynin Receives French Parliamentarian

LD291850 Moscow TASS in English 1837 GMT 29 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow September 29 TASS—Today Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) met with Louis Mermaz, chairman of the parliamentary group of the Franco-Soviet Friendship of the National Assembly of France, who is currently in Moscow among the "Initiative-87" group of representatives of the French public.

M. Mermaz emphasized the importance of the just-delivered speech by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at a meeting with the representatives of the French public. The speech generated an immense interest among them and produced a great impression.

Then there was an exchange of views with Louis Mermaz on concrete nuclear disarmament issues in view of the prospect for the conclusion of Soviet-U.S. agreement on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles, as well as on matters aimed at ensuring all-European cooperation in the spirit of the Helsinki agreements, and at further developing Soviet-French relations.

The meeting was held in a friendly atmosphere.

Voss Receives Spanish Communist Delegation

LD231152 Moscow TASS in English 1122 GMT 23 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow September 23 TASS—On September 22, August Voss, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities (chamber) of the USSR Supreme Soviet (parliament), received a Communist Party of the Peoples of Spain (PCPE) delegation led by Jose Antonio Rubio, member of the Executive Committee of the PCPE Central Committee.

The guests were told about the activities of the top state power body of the USSR aimed at reorganizing all aspects of Soviet society's life and at further developing democracy and openness.

Special attention during the conversation was given to matters pertaining to the solution of the nationalities problem in the Soviet Union.

Latin America

Further on Shevardnadze Visit to Brazil

Troops To Leave DRA 'Soon'

PY292320 Rio de Janeiro Rede Globo Television in Portuguese 2307 GMT 29 Sep 87

[Excerpt] This morning, Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze visited Congress and announced that Mikhail Gorbachev wishes to visit Brazil.

In the afternoon, Shevardnadze held a second working meeting with Brazilian Foreig Minister Abreu Sodre in Itamaraty. The two foreign ministers agreed that peace in Central America is near thanks to the efforts of the Contadora Group. Afterward, Shevardnadze announced that Soviet troops will withdraw from Afghanistan soon. [passage omitted]

Continues Talks With Sodre

LD300251 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0115 GMT 30 Sep 87

[Text] Brasilia, 30 Sep (TASS)—Talks between Eduard Shevardnadze, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR foreign minister, and Roberto Coata de Abreu Sodre, Brazilian foreign minister, have continued. During an exchange of opinions on the situation in various regions of the world, the two spoke in favor of a rapid elimination of sources of tension by peaceful means on the basis of international law.

E. Shevardnadze confirmed the Soviet Union's position in support of a Latin American solution to the problems of Central America and for the efforts of the Contadora Group, the support group, and of other states aimed at a political settlement of the situation surrounding Nicaragua and in the region as a whole.

The two discussed the forms of colonialism and the practise of apartheid that persist in southern Africa and which pose a serious threat to international peace and security, and called for Namibia to be granted its independence immediately. An exchange of opinions connected with a settlement of the situation in the Persian Gulf zone and around Afghanistan was also held.

Due attention was paid to an examination of the problems of international economic relations. The ministers made note of the important significance which the issue of economic security is acquiring in our time, and voiced support for the establishment of a new international economic order and for the adoption of effective measures to ease the developing world's debt burden. A particular place here belongs to the practical realization of the link between disarmament and development, which was confirmed at the recent international conference in New York.

The ministers noted with satisfaction the ongoing and constructive nature of relations between the USSR and Brazil, based on the principles of sovereign equality, mutual respect, and noninterference in internal affairs. They voiced support for an expansion of interaction in international affairs in the interests of the Soviet and the Brazilian peoples, general peace, and cooperation between states. During an examination of trade and economic links, the need was stressed for their continued diversification and growth in accordance with the potential opportunities of the two countries.

On behalf of the Soviet Government, E. Shevardnadze invited Brazilian Foreign Minister R. Sodre to pay an official visit to the Soviet Union. The invitation was accepted with pleasure.

A joint communique will be published on the outcome of the talks.

E. Shevardnadze visited the National Congress, where he met H. Lucena, president of the Senate, and U. Guimaraes, president of the Chamber of Deputies. During the ensuing conversations it was noted that the interparliamentary links, whose development is supported by both sides, play a noteworthy role in raising the level of trust and mutual understanding between the Soviet and Brazilian peoples.

That same day a conversation took place between E. Shevardnadze and L.R. Mayer, president of the Supreme Court.

Sodre Previews Visit

PM291519 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Sep 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Unnamed TASS correspondent dispatch: "On the Principles of Equality and Respect"]

[Text] Brasilia, 25 Sep—Soviet-Brazilian relations are based on the principles of sovereign equality and noninterference in one another's internal affairs, Brazilian Foreign Minister Roberto Costa de Abreu Sodre declared. He granted an interview here to TASS correspondent Vladimir Golenkov in connection with the forthcoming official visit to Brazil by E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister.

Since my predecessor's official visit to Moscow in December 1985, bilateral relations at all levels have become more meaningful, the minister pointed out. Political dialogue took the form of messages exchanged between President Jose Sarney of Brazil and M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and also of political consultations enabling the two countries' foreign ministers to exchange important information on questions concerning the international situation and bilateral relations. E.A. Shevardnadze's official visit to Brazil will become a new and important landmark in our relations. It will enable the sides to get to know each other better, let alone that it will provide a unique opportunity to discuss questions of the greatest importance for both countries. The Brazilian government, the minister went on, carefully follows the latest Soviet initiatives on nuclear disarmament, starting with the program for complete elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000 formulated in M.S. Gorbachev's 15 January 1986 statement. A complete ban on nuclear weapon tests and the termination of the arms race, like the adoption of specific measures on nuclear disarmament, are in line with the fundamental principles of Brazil's policy. We have already emphasized that the powers already possessing a military-nuclear potential bear a particular responsibility for the disarmament process. In this context the Brazilian Government is especially interested in the likelihood of a treaty on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles being concluded in the immediate future, which will become the first agreement on disarmament—in the literal meaning of the word—in our nuclear age. We believe that the improvement of mutual understanding between the USSR and the United States in this regard testifies to the possibility of new and important steps in the disarmament sphere, provided that the efforts made at international forums on disarmament questions and the bilateral talks on that same subject are combined into a single whole. The Brazilian Government, R. Costa de Abreu Sodre went on to say, supported the holding of an international conference on the interconnection between disarmament and development, since one of the basic principles of Brazil's policy in the disarmament sphere envisages the need to utilize the funds now expended on

the arms race, primarily the nuclear arms race, for the implementation of socioeconomic development programs. This would produce a gain primarily for developing countries, as Brazil's president remarked at the 40th UN General Assembly session. Without nurturing any excessive hopes, but at the same time also without skepticism, the Brazilian Government believes that the international conference on the interconnection between disarmament and development became an important forum for the discussion of this question. In this context the Brazilian Government has already emphasized that in our world, with its limited resources, there exists a clear contradiction between the arms race, primarily the nuclear arms race, and social and economic development.

Without automatically linking the questions of disarmament and development, the minister declared, the Brazilian Government nonetheless believes that it is necessary to achieve harmony between these two goals on a large scale and in the foreseeable future. A particular role in this direction must be played by the nuclear powers.

Assessing the situation in Central America, R. Costa de Abreu Sodre stressed that a political settlement in the region is directly dependent on the implementation of the accords signed at the meeting of presidents from five of the region's countries in Guatemala last August. I have already had occasion to remark, he said, that the Guatemala agreement is of major political importance, since it reaffirms the will and desire of most Central American countries to seek solution to the conflict via talks. This desire for peace was fully backed by the Contadora Group and the Support Group, and this backing was expressed in a statement published following the meeting of member countries' foreign ministers in Sao Paolo in August. Bearing all these facts in mind, I am optimistic about the prospect of political settlement of the crisis in the region. By participating in the international monitoring commission, the Contadora Group and Support Group countries continue to make efforts to solve the crisis by peaceful means, as they have done always, even at the times when a clash seemed inevitable as a result of growing tension in Central America, the Brazilian foreign minister said in conclusion.

Brazil's President Sarney Greeted on Jubilee

PM291319 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Sep 87 Morning Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Cable Exchange"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has sent Brazilian President Jose Sarney Costa a telegram on the 165th anniversary of the proclamation of Brazilian independence, expressing sincere congratulations and good wishes for success and prosperity to the country's president and the friendly Brazilian people. The telegram notes the steady development of multifaceted cooperation between the USSR and Brazil and expresses confidence that it will continue to expand and deepen for the good of both countries' peoples and in the interests of peace and international security.

In his reply telegram on behalf of the Brazilian people and government and on his own account President Jose Sarney Costa expresses gratitude for the congratulations and hopes that the relations of friendship and cooperation between our countries will continue to develop for the good of our peoples.

PCC Central Committee Plenum Begins 26 Sep

Focus on Social Issues

PM291146 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Sep 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Havana, 26 Sep — Important questions of the all-around development of Cuban society are being discussed at the Communist Party of Cuba [PCC] Central Committee Plenum which has begun here under the chairmanship of Fidel Castro, first secretary of the PCC Central Committee and chairman of the Republic's Councils of State and Ministers. The main aim of the plenum, the newspaper *Granma* writes, is to continue a detailed analysis of the process of rectifying mistakes on a countrywide scale and to study its progress in each province, in the activity of the party organizations, and in the main administrative bodies.

The plenum heard and discussed reports from the first secretaries of the communist party executive bureaus of the provinces of Holguin, Santiago de Cuba, and Guantanamo. There was an analysis of the results of measures adopted in these provinces to improve production organiztion, increase labor discipline, and save raw materials and resources, as well as to involve party organizations and all Communists actively in the struggle to rectify the errors that have occurred.

The process that has begun, the plenum participants stressed, has laid the foundations for profound transformations, despite the country's difficult financial position and the severe drought that extensive regions of Cuba are suffering. The plenum stressed the need to continue the unremitting struggle to overcome the existing difficulties and prevent the revival of the negative phenomena already eliminated.

In the course of the plenum particular attention was devoted to the help and support given by the party and all the people to the resolution of the housing problem, the construction of social and consumer facilities, and in general the comprehensive development of Havana. The

plenum assessed this area of activity as a kind of laboratory for the development of creative formulas that could be used for the rational resolution of similar problems in other parts of the country.

The plenum discussed measures to further improve cadre policy, increase exactingness, and support the natural renewal of cadres from among the tens of thousands of young, capable specialists molded and educated by the revolution.

Reviews Criminal Code

PM291335 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Sep 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Havana, 27 Sep—A Communist Party of Cuba [PCC] Central Committee plenum held under the chairmanship of Fidel Castro, first secretary of the PCC Central Committee and president of the Republic Councils of State and Ministers, has concluded its work here. Its participants discussed reports by the first secretaries of a number of eastern provinces and of the Isla de Juventud Special Municipality, as well as the draft amendments to the Republic's criminal code. The successes achieved in those parts of the country in the course of the process of rectifying mistakes were noted, and attention was drawn to unresolved tasks.

Cuban Interior Minister Jose Abrahantes, who spoke on the draft amendments to the criminal code, emphasized that these amendments are aimed at improving the code by means of a more efficient elaboration of the system of sanctions for various offenses, particularly the wider use of fines and other measures of a corrective nature. In addition, it is proposed to increase liability for certain types of crimes, including official crimes.

Speaking at the close of the plenum, F. Castro rated highly the results of its work and proposed including on the agenda of the next Central Committee plenum a discussion of the ministers' reports on the process of rectifying mistakes in the sectors and departments which they head. He emphasized the urgent need for all Communists to participate actively in the search for new ideas and initiatives and for revolutionary ways to resolve the tasks of development facing the country.

F. Castro pointed out that the process of rectifying mistakes is gathering momentum. He pointed to the need to involve the people's masses in this process and ensure that it reaches the most distant corners of the country.

Knyazyuk, Delegation Leave for Caracas

PM291148 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Sep 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "At the Invitation of the Communist Party of Venezuela"]

[Text] A CPSU delegation headed by M.A. Knyazyuk, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of Ivanovo CPSU Obkom, left Moscow for Caracas 26 September at the invitation of the Communist Party of Venezuela.

Delegation Returns From Jamaica Conference

PM291150 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Sep 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Delegation's Return"]

[Text] A CPSU delegation headed by N. Y. Klepach, chief editor of the journal *Politicheskoye Samoobrazovaniye*, returned to Moscow 26 September after taking part in the 49th conference of the People's National Party of Jamaica.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Leaves Moscow For Murmansk

LD300745 Moscow TASS in English 0743 GMT 30 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow September 30 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, left Moscow for Murmansk today.

Arrival in Murmansk

LD301130 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 30 Sep 87

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, arrived in Murmansk today from Moscow.

At the airport in Murmansk he was met by Comrade Ptitsyn, first secretary of the Murmansk Obkom; Comrade Balakshin, chairman of the Murmansk Oblispolkom; members of the obkom bureau; and representatives of the public.

Murmansk History Reviewed

LD301018 Moscow TASS in English 1012 GMT 30 Sep 87

["Mikhail Gorbachev Flies to Murmansk"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow September 30 TASS—Today Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, departed from Moscow for Murmansk. Heroic events in the history of the Soviet land are connected with this port city on the coast of the Kola gulf of the Barents Sea.

The city was founded in 1916 as a base connecting the Allies with Russia during the First World War. Today Murmansk is called a center of the Soviet fishing industry and a gate of the USSR to the Arctic.

Understanding the strategic importance of Murmansk, Nazi Germany devoted to it a place of prominence in its plans of conquest. In the autumn of 1941 crack Wehrmacht divisions were stopped by the Red Army at the approaches to Murmansk. The Nazis failed to capture the city during the Second World War, losing some 100,000 officers and men, nearly 2,000 planes, over 800 waships and transports.

Great were also sacrifices of Murmansk defenders. But the Soviet people will never forget the names of heroes of the city's defenders. They also pay homage to the memory of Soviet allies in the anti-Nazi coalition. Murmansk residents carefully look after the graves of British, French, Polish, American and Australian sailors, as well as representatives of other countries which fought against fascist occupiers. A memorial in honour of colloboration of the countries of the anti-Nazi coalition stands in the centre of Murmansk as a symbol of forces of peace and cooperation.

Leaders Address Cadre Training Participants

PM291353 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Sep 87 Second Edition p2

[TASS report: "Cadre Training"]

[Text] A training course for the chiefs of industrial and machine building departments of union republic Communist Party central committees and kraykoms and obkoms has ended at the CPSU Central Committee Social Sciences Academy Institute for Raising the Qualifications of Leading Party, Soviet, and Ideological Cadres.

They studied topical issues of Marxist-Leninist theory and CPSU policy in light of the restructuring concept developed by the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and the decisions adopted by the 27th CPSU Congress and subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums. Main attention was focused on the questions of implementing the party's strategic course to accelerate the country's socioeconomic development. Specific ways to implement party resolutions on the priority development of the machine building complex, ensure that the machinery, equipment, and instruments produced are of the highest world standard, and draw up and implement long-term programs to update and modernize production were discussed. The main emphasis was placed on successfully completing the current year's plans and worthily greeting the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution.

A great deal of attention was given to preparations for transferring the machine building complex to operating in the conditions of the USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association), full economic accountability [khozraschet], and self-financing. These problems were examined in close conjunction with social practice, the deepening of the democratization of society, the broadening of glasnost, and the development of people's self-management. The need for party committees to play a leading role in restructuring and for further improvements in cadre work was underlined.

The students were addressed by L.N. Zaykov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary ; V.I. Dolgikh, CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member and CPSU Central Committee secretary; Yu.P. Batalin and L.A. Voronin, deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers; R.G. Yanovskiy, rector of the CPSU Central Committee Social Sciences Academy; O.G. Anfimov, B.I. Gostev, Yu.A. Izrael, M.A. Korolev, N.A. Panichev, and M.S. Shkabardnya, USSR ministers and USSR state committee chairmen; V.I. Pimenov, V.I. Davydov, I.A. Zaramenskiy, and G.K. Kryuchkov, first deputy and

deputy heads of CPSU Central Committee departments; A.F. Kamenev, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for Machine Building; R.D. Margulov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for the Fuel and Power Complex; K.V. Frolov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; G.F. Sukhoruchenkova, secretary of the AUCCTU; USSR deputy ministers and USSR state committee deputy chairmen; and the managers of machine building enterprises.

The speeches by V.A. Lepeshkin, secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee; V.D. Kadochnikov, first secretary of the Sverdlovsk Gorkom; S.G. Petrov, secretary of the Leningrad Gorkom; and others dealt with questions of local party bodies' activity in the restructuring context.

The students were acquainted with the work practice of party organizations in the new conditions on practical courses in Kuybyshev and Sumi Oblasts and Moscow enterprises.

During the seminar sessions the students exchanged experience of party committee work in the conditions of radically restructuring economic management and transferring to new economic management methods. There were meetings with senior members of the CPSU Central Committee, ministries, and departments, leading specialists at enterprises, scientists, and journalists.

Zaykov Attends Machine Builders' Day Meeting
PM291341 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Sep 87 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Ceremonial Meeting"]

[Text] Ways of making fuller use of the reserves for boosting labor productivity and accelerating production growth rates were discussed by the participants in a ceremonial meeting devoted to Machine Builders' Day. It was held in Moscow 25 September.

The presidium comprised L.N. Zaykov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary; Yu.D. Maslyukov and I.S. Silayev, deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers; O.S. Belyakov and A.I. Volskiy, CPSU Central Committee department chiefs; leaders of ministries and departments, front-rankers of socialist competition, scientists, and representatives of the public.

A report was delivered by G.B. Stroganov, deputy chairman of the USSR Gosplan.

Lukyanov Attends 25 Sep Moscow Concert
PM291345 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Sep 87 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Outstanding Premiere"]

[Excerpts] Resurrecting noble traditions, a charity concert organized by the Soviet Cultural Foundation has been held in Moscow—the first for many years. It was held at the State Central Concert Hall 25 September. [passage omitted]

The concert was attended by A.I. Lukyanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Sakharov Article 'Hopeful' About Reform
AU301452 Paris AFP in English 1424 GMT 30 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow, Sept 30 (AFP)—Dissident scientist Andrey Sakharov has said he is hopeful about Kremlin leader Mikhail Gorbachev's reform program but feels that Soviet intellectuals are still undervalued.

A senior Soviet journalist meanwhile indicated that dissident newsheets were unlikely to be legalized and said a planned new press law was being postponed.

In his first article in an official publication since being allowed by Mr. Gorbachev to return from internal exile in Gorkiy, Mr. Sakharov said that the Soviet Union's "process of transforming and purifying life is gaining momentum."

"I am particularly pleased about that," he told *Theater*, a periodical published by the Culture Ministry and the Union of Soviet Writers.

Mr. Sakharov said: "Criticism of negative phenomena of the past and the will to unite all the forces in our society behind the restructuring programme are a source of hope."

The dissident physicist dwelled on the role of the Soviet intelligentsia, adding that he felt it was still insufficiently understood.

Meanwhile, Valentin Falin, head of the official *Novosti* press agency, in a meeting here with a delegation from the Franco-Soviet Friendship Association, was questioned by reporters about the chances that dissident newsheets such as the publication *Glasnost*, which have surfaced recently, might be legalized.

Mr. Falin replied that "a newspaper which affects people's behavior should be subjected to controls, in the same way as a medicine."

He also said that the adoption of a new Soviet press law was being postponed. "We thought it would be ready by the end of 1987, but it seems now that if it is adopted, it will more likely be next year."

Mr. Falin said the publication *Glasnost* was guilty of libel and added: "If this newssheet were officially registered, its author, Sergey Grigoryants, would be taken to court."

Six Thousand Jews Emigrate in 8 Months

AU291929 Paris AFP in English 1917 GMT 29 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow, Sept 29 (AFP)—More than 6,000 Jews were allowed to emigrate from the Soviet Union in the first eight months of this year, over six times the number permitted to leave last year, a Soviet official said Tuesday.

The 6,094 authorized to leave between January and the end of August, included 1,312 minors, Samuel Zvis, vice-president of the Soviet Anti-Zionist Committee said.

The figure compared with fewer than 1,000 departures allowed in 1986.

Mr. Zvis was taking part in a forum on human rights organized by the Franco-Soviet Association.

Another official, Rudolf Kuznetsov, head of the Soviet visa and aliens' registration authority, said that a Supreme Soviet commission was currently studying the emigration request of Naum Meiman, a 76-year-old rights activist.

Mr. Meiman is a founder member of a Moscow group monitoring the 1975 Helsinki Accords.

The dissident has been refused permission to leave the country, although his daughter has been allowed to emigrate and his wife, a cancer sufferer, died shortly after arriving in the United States early this year.

Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in a meeting at the Kremlin on Tuesday with a French Jewish community leader Henri Bulawko, asserted that the argument that Soviet Jews "live in distressed circumstances does not hold water."

Georgian Protests Delay Railroad Project

AU301613 Paris AFP in English 1609 GMT 30 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow, Sept 30 (AFP)—Public protests have forced authorities in the southern Republic of Georgia to postpone for one year a decision on whether to forge ahead with a plan for a railway line which would tunnel through the Caucasus mountains, Georgian officials said Wednesday.

The head of the Tbilisi research institute in charge of the one-billion-ruble (1.5 billion dollar) project, Leonid Kvartskhava, contacted by telephone said that a commission had been set up in order to "eliminate obstacles". It would particularly address ecological objections raised by the project's opponents.

Petitions have been circulating since June-July in the Georgian capital, where an AFP reporter was told this week that there were fears that Tbilisi's drinking water from the river Aragvi would be polluted by the railway line planned to run alongside.

The 185-kilometre (115 mile) line is to pass through the mountains from Ordzhonikidze south to Tbilisi, with a total seven tunnels planned, the longest being 23 kilometers. An engineer involved in the scheme said it was "the most ambitious rail project" since the Trans-Siberian railway.

Georgian officials said the decision to put off the decision on whether to complete the project was taken at a Central Committee meeting of the Georgian Communist party earlier this month, but Tbilisi residents said that the debate was still raging despite the concession to public opinion.

One petition made available to AFP, which has been signed by 2,000 people since July, quoted scientists and experts opposed to the railway line on grounds that its construction would destroy archaeological sites, risked upsetting the ecological balance, and had no economic justification.

The petition warned that the railway line would be built at a height where snow accumulated, and would increase the risk of mountain avalanches. "The tragedy of this winter was one example of the consequences of aggressing nature," it said, referring to a series of deadly avalanches.

The Communist Party daily *Pravda* last March blamed "constructors" for ripping up trees from mountain slopes without realizing that the trees had stemmed the avalanches' force.

The other national newspaper *Izvestiya* said that 110 people were killed in the avalanches which destroyed 4,500 houses, but the Georgian press has never published a complete toll.

Supporters of the plan criticize its detractors for being dyed-in-the-wool Georgian nationalists who basically fear that the railway line will "open up" the republic to greater Russian influence.

A Georgian official formerly connected with the railway project said that although the protests were continuing, "we must persuade them. Now there are people who begin to understand."

Authorities apparently believe that the decision will be taken to pursue the project after the 12-month postponement. Mr. Kvartskhava said an exploratory 23-kilometer tunnel had already been drilled through the mountains, and that preparatory work would continue despite the moratorium.

The debate over the TransCaucasus railway shows the growing awareness in the Soviet Union of environmental issues — in August last year the Politburo decided to halt a plan to divert Siberian rivers into the south after protests.

Existence of 'Forbidden Zones' Scored

PM300909 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Sep 87 Morning Edition p 6

[Letter from G. Sadovnichenko, director of the Ukrainian Republic's "Mayak" Book Publishing House, under the "Editorial Mailbag" rubric: "Forbidden Zone. Apropos the Rejoinder 'Visa to Moldavia' (IZVESTIYA No. 250)"; last three paragraphs are editorial comment]

[Text] Odessa—First of all I must thank the newspaper for finally "uncorking" the bottle with a forbidden subject. Second, I can only sympathize with the author. But at least he got into Moldavia from another republic. But what can we, people living in Odessa Oblast, do? After all, our border zone begins 1 hour on the train from Odessa. Moreover, we do not even have to cross the border of a neighboring republic or another oblast to find ourselves in "forbidden territory."

The entire Black Sea coast from the resort of Karolino-Bugaz to the mouth of the Danube and further up the river is hundreds of kilometres of forbidden zone. You can only go to the resorts of Karolino-Bugaz (a unique 11-kilometer-long sandy spit), Zatoka, Sergeyevka, Lebedevka, Primorskoye, and many others under the following circumstances: if you have a voucher to a rest home or a boarding house, at the invitation of relatives living in populated areas in the border zone, or with a travel warrant for official business. You cannot just go to the sea on your day off!

You cannot freely visit the city of Izmail, famed for its feat of Russian arms, with its diorama and A.V. Suvorov Museum. Not many people realize that the merchant shipping port of Reni is the largest on the Danube and one of the largest in the country in terms of the volume of freight handling. They do not realize because the city of Reni itself is "closed" to Soviet citizens. But hundreds, even thousands of foreign seamen come here. In Izmail you can see a considerable number of foreign tourists from Vienna, apart from the seamen.

You have heard of Vilkovo, of course—the city on the Danube which our brother journalist will not fail to call the "Venice of the Ukraine." True, it is quite far removed from Venice in Italy, but its canals with their scurrying boats, its lush greenery, small wooden bridges, and, the main thing, its people—the Lipovane, descendants of the Russian Old Believers who found refuge on the Danube—have always attracted tourists. It used to be the case that the "Belinskiy" slow boat made trips between Izmail and Odessa. Entire labor collectives from Odessa would charter this ship to admire the Danubian straits and flats, the Vilkovo canals, and the sights of Izmail. And now? Now I must say without a grain of humor or exaggeration that my children and even my grandchildren have never been to Vilkovo and have no chance to go there in the future: We have no friends or relatives there. All I can do is give them copies of books about Vilkovo brought out several years ago by our publishing house.

It has been suggested that we publish a book about our Danubian islands. We have given the idea some thought, but who would buy such a book? If anyone did buy it, they would read it, breathe a sigh, and dream about the islands' wealth of flora and fauna of which they had read or learned from television programs.

Now, let us suppose that you have friends or relatives in one of the border zone's populated areas. You ask them to arrange an invitation for you. It takes absolutely ages to organize this and obtain permission (weeks, if not months!). As if you are planning a journey to the shores of the Amazon rather than to somewhere in your own native region of Odessa. You will waste several hours standing in line for your visa (you need a written letter from the relevant organizations in addition to a certificate if you are going on a business trip).

Here is another curious fact. The village of Shabo in Belgorod-Dnestrovskiy Rayon is situated several kilometers from the Black Sea coast and 200 kilometers from the Romanian border on the Danube. This village is also in the border zone... So you will not be able to simply enjoy the fruits of the famous Shabo vineyards.

I went on a business trip to Izmail this summer. Traveling first by sea and then following the Danube, the high-speed "Kometa" brought me rapidly to my destination in a matter of 5 hours. Stopping at several towns along the way, I saw border guards checking the documents of arrivals on the quayside. In Izmail a young man in a green cap carefully studied the permit stamp on my certificate and carefully checked the photograph in my passport against the original. I felt rather uncomfortable beneath the scrutinizing gaze of this border guard conscientiously doing his duty. I even felt rather guilty for some reason.

Many people cannot understand these supervigilant measures as a result of which not just tourists on a motoring holiday from Murmansk but even the inhabitants of Odessa and other cities and villages in the oblast cannot visit the wonderful beaches stretching from Karolino-Bugaz (an hour away by train) to the mouth of the Danube, go fishing in the lower reaches of the Danube and off the Danubian islands, or go boating along the Vilkovo canals.

No, we do not understand, and no one will explain to us. If these things are not made known, rumors abound. It used to be said at one time that Izmail had been "closed" because of its flea market—apparently speculators from the oblast center paid regular visits there to make contact

with their local counterparts. But all the flea markets have long been closed and still the city is not reopened. Evil tongues say that the Black Sea resort region has been closed down completely because of "unofficial tourists" who have inundated the beaches and made a mess. Moreover, these (albeit "unofficial") tourists had to be fed and watered and provided with swimsuits and toilet facilities. It was then, apparently, that the decision was made—better not to "let them in" than to have to build canteens and stores, a water supply system, a sewerage system, and toilets.

When you go to Izmail by bus you have to cross the border zone twice. Twice (before Karolino-Bugaz and Izmail) the road is intersected by barriers and signs saying "STOP! Border Zone. All Documents Requested."

You appear to have touched on a very important subject, but we must not stop here. We must allow working people into these wonderful places in the Black Sea and Danube region—places of which we are proud but which thousands of people living in Odessa and the rest of the oblast know about only by hearsay. We must also make these beaches and sights along the Danube accessible to people living in the north, who would love to see the sun, the sea, grapes, melons, and a little consideration.

From the Editorial Office: We have received this kind of response to the rejoinder "Visa to Moldavia" from various places and different people—people living in border regions, readers whose work involves business trips, and lovers of tourism and travel, who have come up against unwarranted complications on more than one occasion when visiting various parts of the country.

As we have seen from all this mail, these prohibited zones stretch over a very large area. In Magadan Oblast, for example, people are so restricted in their movements that they are not allowed virtually within thousands of kilometers of the strait separating our country from the neighboring state. This oblast lies in the northeast. Our publication dealt with a settlement situated in the southwest. This means that the same restrictions apply from the extreme west of the country to the extreme east. Today, in the atmosphere of really democratic transformations affecting every aspect of our lives without exception and, in particular—we will stress this once again—considerably simplifying the procedure for business and tourist trips to socialist countries and reciprocal visits to relatives living on different sides of the border, these restrictions are like an echo of the past, a legacy of the era when there were all manner of numerous prohibitions.

The editorial board expects this issue to be resolved. This solution should not be based on the convenience of this or that department used to making life easy for itself by ignoring the interests of thousands of people, but on the interests described above. The democratization process must also extend to our borders.

Party Admissions Procedure Criticized

PM291535 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 23 Sep 87 Second Edition p 1

[Article under the "Our Dialogue" rubric by Tatyana Bondarenko: "The Value of the Party Card"; first three paragraphs are reader's letter]

[Text] "Hello, Comrades! I know you must have lots of letters to read but nevertheless I put pen to paper anyway. I wanted to have my say and to share with you my thoughts and doubts—call it what you will.

"I think that all the evil which has built up so much and which we are finding it so hard to eradicate stems primarily from the party admissions system."

"N. Morozova, Novosibirsk"

That extract comes from a letter which the editorial office received recently. I do not hide the fact, Comrade Morozova, that at first I was tempted to agree with you. In our country the party rules, there are Communists in all the key sections of the national economy, and if it is going wrong the easiest thing is to put that down to shortcomings in the admissions procedure. It is said that the wrong people are being chosen, their training is bad, trust is being placed in the wrong people, and so on. Yes, quite a few errors have come to light here, about which we both have the fullest and most reliable information from the party documents of the past 2 years. It is common knowledge, however, that thousands, millions of honest and uncompromising Communists have always toiled selflessly in their place of work fully devoting not only the power of their mind and heart but often their life, too.

As for the party admissions procedure, much of what you say here is right. However, it can hardly be presented as the main source of "all the evil," as you try to do. After all, given the tendency toward universal bureaucratization, this procedure has also become a kind of automatic system. Gradually a confusion has occurred: no longer selection but the issuing of application forms, not a vote but a ceremony whose outcome is decided in advance...

It is true that we cannot yet say that all this is a thing of the past. The editorial office has received reports from readers (such as Yu. Degovikov from Yoshkar-Ola, A. Mikhno from Stavropol Kray, R. Batyrova from Moscow, R. Klapper from Vladivostok, S. Krasnopevtsev from Sverdlovsk Oblast, Kh. Usmanov from Krasnodar Kray, and many others) that the practice of "membership quotas" ["raznaryadka"] still thrives: that candidate members nowadays are sometimes just like passengers in transit spending a year snoozing in a waiting room and they look so lacking in initiative and inspiration that doubts arise—Who needs future fighters of this

type? Letters talk about the "zero responsibility" of sponsors. A note of alarm is sounded by the question: Why do other party card holders not cherish the party's honor and name?

Your own message may provide at least a partial reply. You describe in detail how your classmate joined the party for purely careerist reasons and did not hide the fact:

"I was horrified," was how you describe your state then. "For me the concept of the 'party' was something lofty, sacred, and accessible in practice only to the very worthy. Probably that was why I considered myself unworthy... I believed that I had not yet done anything to justify dreaming about party membership..."

In other words: In some people careerism, the driving force pushing them to acquire a party card, was and still is a real phenomenon. Just like the system of "membership quotas," which no one refers to without adding an ironic "notorious." Take, for instance, the case you cite in your letter concerning the designer who transferred temporarily from the design bureau to the shop because he knew he could gain admission more quickly that way. The application form is just like a lottery ticket nowadays. Who will be the lucky winner? A man? A woman? A worker? A Komsomol member? An employee—aged under 30 or over?

It is a well-known fact that the party has defined its attitude toward and sharply criticized that kind of approach, and a real cleansing of party ranks can already be sensed now. This is promoted to a great extent by glasnost, the frankness of opinions and assessments, a more thorough self-analysis by primary party organizations, and the very commitment in society now. You only have to look and you will see that in actual fact thousands of people who to some extent failed to meet the requirements of the Statutes have been expelled in every sphere in the past 2 years. Furthermore, a certain decline in the party's growth rate has been noticed—due to the increased exactingness in selection.

But it would be an act of unpardonable negligence to underestimate the power of inertia. Some party committees continue to issue streams of "quota" documents.

Matters can reach extremes. The Novolipetsk Metallurgical Combine's party organization found its own way of increasing the proportion of worker members. Taking advantage of the fact that VUZ and technical college graduates receive on-the-job training it set about recruiting them into the party as workers.

I would not like you to think that the regulation of the composition of party ranks is completely optional. Let us consider the matter. Let us presume that all the doors were thrown wide open. What happens? An organization with open borders ceases to be an organization. Incidentally, Lenin wrote very sensibly and fearlessly on this: "...it goes without saying that the worst elements will attach themselves to a ruling party precisely because it is the ruling party." And he added: "The party must be so restricted as to admit in addition to the working class only those people from other classes who can be most carefully scrutinized"...

It does not matter that times have changed. Our aims are no less complex, there is no lack of dialectical contradictions or difficult tasks. Restructuring needs a rapid and mobile vanguard detachment just as much as and probably more than the other stages of our society's development.

Sometimes people say: What is the point of the candidate member's probationary period? It is to see who is suitable to volunteer for the party and who is not. Agreed. But is it worth examining someone who even at first glance is not very suitable?

I remember how, on the eve of the 27th party congress when the draft party documents were being discussed, the editorial office received a host of readers' suggestions. They included some along these lines. Compare the candidate's probationary period with the period taken to fulfill a specific task. Set the candidate member a task. Let him report back. If he has completed it, he is accepted. The reports could be delivered not on topics like "undergoing the candidate's probation" but on "the introduction of economic accountability [khozraschet] in a section by such and such a candidate," "the organization of catering during the night shift by such and such a candidate," and so on. Sensible suggestions but... not original. The same things have already been said in the Statutes—everyone must be tested by his actions.

Here is a most important problem. How to give everyone a job to do? Report-and-election meetings are now in progress. Why not make it clear what work candidates have been asked to do? Why not check what specifically each Communist has done in restructuring? We are on the verge of a new economic situation: The Law on the Enterprise is going into force and full economic accountability and the principle of self-financing are beginning to operate. This new situation requires many activists—competent, intelligent, determined, industrious people. Thus, it is not only changes in the production sphere that are in the offing but also the establishment of a new atmosphere in the collective. No party meeting, especially not a policy or report-and-election meeting, can avoid that.

It is sometimes distressing to read letters from primary party organizations where a comrade is refused admission on "dubious" grounds: Someone has taken umbrage at criticism that he made or resented his too active civic or professional stance. This is also typical: Hostility toward an active person goes hand in hand with unprincipledness. Increasingly often the mailbag now contains letters on repeat admission. The reason is clear. Many injustices of previous years are now coming to light. The

facts are being published. How many economic managers have suffered because they set their sense of enterprise in opposition to hidebound instructions! Restoring justice in their case is not only sensible but also economically worthwhile. Guilt in the face of instructions is one thing, but self-interest, amorality, and bribery are quite another.

The primary party organization of the Tyumen Silica Products Plant unanimously readmitted plant director V. Cherepanov into the party a second time. He had been expelled the first time because when he was secretary of a sovkhoz party committee he misappropriated party members' subscriptions. However, even his candidate's probationary period had not gone smoothly—a large number of serious personal criticisms had been made. Did the party collective treat its decision responsibly? The question arises: How do young candidates feel at joining in the company of this "returnee"? After all, they are all lumped together, those who have applied to join and are uncertain about whether or not they will be admitted to the party. If those who were previously uncertain and who settled nothing less than their own fate by joining the party can see the passivity and lack of principle of the organization accepting them or of the party member who became intoxicated and crazed with power and who long ago forgot his social duty, then what is to be expected from those who are not yet tempered? In Amur Oblast in the last 6 months alone, 220 candidates and applicants have withdrawn their membership applications.

...You are right, Comrade Morozva: Mistakes with admissions can tarnish or undermine faith in the Communist's pure aspect. The party is now seeking to restore that faith according to all the canons of Bolshevik times. We are learning to make different demands and to view one another differently.

It is reported that at open party meetings in some cities and rayons a preliminary discussion is being held of the professional and moral qualities of those who have expressed a desire to join the party. It is only after they have received support there that they can fill out the application form and look for sponsors. In other places the collective is notified in advance about applications and the day they are to be examined. The method of critical analysis is used when hearing reports on the candidate's probationary period in Tomsk and Irkutsk Oblasts...

It is too early to talk about the results of these new forms of admission. But the early signs are encouraging.

...Our discussion has become wide ranging. But there is another point I should still like to make. You write that when you saw how easily a careerist entered the party you vowed not to join—"so as not be in the same company as her." Deep down you must surely realize that a "self-denial" of that kind is more like self-alienation or worse. Unfortunately this path is sometimes also taken by Communists who seem to forget the original purpose of joining the party—"not for the quiet life but for hard work." Perhaps it would be nice to be in the company of people of impeccable character and moral values identical to yours. But let us be honest: uniform thinking [odnomysliye] has never increased the party's "strength," quite the reverse, and party-mindedness has always been the greatest self-regulator. It has also helped to hone outstanding human qualities.

Front-line soldiers going into what could be their last battle wanted to be considered Communists. I think you will agree that we have become used to seeing that solely from the viewpoint of patriotic sacrifice. But can it not be assumed that people were thereby announcing the birth of a new spiritual quality—party-mindedness? Communists have different fates, their lives have different ends. The one common feature is that they are true to their goal and their duty, they consistently defend the party's ideas as a personal program for life.

...A process of communist rebirth in the full sense is taking place within the party today. It promises to be cleansing and healing. So long as each of us invests our strength in it, of course. You, too, Comrade Morozova, are concerned by this and it is with good reason that you end your letter with the following words: "I still wonder whether I am worthy or not..." That seems to me a good question.

People's Control Chief on Restructuring

PM291555 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Sep 87 Second Edition p 2

[Article by S. Manyakin, chairman of the USSR People's Control Committee: "Restructuring and Control. Priority Avenues in the Work of the USSR People's Control Committee and All the Country's Control Personnel"]

[Text] There is no sphere in the country's life which has not been affected by restructuring. The revolutionary renewal of our society which was initiated by the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum has become the main feature of our time.

Restructuring and democratization pose the question of control in our country in a new light. Let us be frank and admit that the existing system of control is ineffective, excessively fragmented, absorbs a mass of people and resources, and—most importantly—it is locked in departmental and local interests and is largely dependant on the very organizations and officials whom it is called upon to monitor. It is quite obvious now that it is necessary to rethink this whole matter, to focus control on key areas, and to make it deeper and more comprehensive.

V.I. Lenin attached paramount importance to the organization of control in the socialist state placing it "...always on a par with the dictatorship of the proletariat, always right behind it..." After the victory of October

Lenin's thoughts returned again and again to the organization of a comprehensive, constantly operating control, watching over the interests of the people. Until the highest phase of communism is achieved, he taught, socialism needs rigorous control, coming both from society and from the state. The experience of our recent past shows that forgetting this instruction, any weakening of control, is fraught with the most serious of consequences.

Defining the main avenues of the radical restructuring of economic management, the Central Committee June (1987) Plenum adopted the decision to create a unified, integrated system of control based on the USSR People's Control Committee, a system which would be invested with extensive powers throughout the country's territory and would conduct its work proceeding exclusively from nationwide positions based on broad glasnost.

The aim of creating such a system would be the subordination of control activities to statewide interests, to the cause of restructuring, so that people's control becomes an effective means of revealing new pressing questions, so that it becomes one of the most important forms of involving the masses in the process of self-management of the affairs of society and the state. The task has been set of fully mastering the Leninist principle of socialist control which combines broadest democracy with party leadership.

The situation makes its imperative, M.S. Gorbachev has said, to ensure that the socialist system of people's control is more active, that it tackles major socioeconomic problems, and that it stops leaders who have lost interest in state affairs from taking it easy.

Implementing the Plenum decisions, the USSR People's Control Committee has elaborated priority avenues of control work through 1990. They orient all people's control organs toward active participation in the solution of the most vital questions. The work centers on the implementation of party and government directives on the acceleration of economic and social development. We regard this as the main sphere in which the efforts of people's control should be focused.

The priority avenues include problems of scientific and technical progress, reconstruction and retooling of production, and improvement of output quality. Take, for instance, the machine-building sector. Time itself has placed it in the vanguard of restructuring. Unless a substantial and qualitative leap forward is achieved here, the entire program of the intensification of the national economy may be jeopardized. Recently we have investigated the situation in the production of new generations of machinery. Thirty-nine republic, kray, and oblast committees took part in this investigation which covered all the ministries in this complex and 155 associations and enterprises. The problem was studied comprehensively, from the elaboration of the blueprints for the new machinery at scientific research institutes and design bureaus, to the time of its arrival on the production line.

The broad investigation covering the whole process from beginning to end has made it possible to make a thorough analysis of the causes of the unfavorable situation prevailing at many enterprises and also in ministry apparatuses. Specific proposals have been submitted to the Central Committee and the government. We are aware that their implementation will depend largely on constant and principled control of their execution. The most important thing here is not to waste time and to avoid acting as mere recorders of facts as has often been the case in the past.

A key place in the priority avenues of the work of the USSR People's Control Committee is assigned to the social sphere which directly affects people's most vital interests. Our organs, the millions of people who work in them, are constantly monitoring the implementation of the Food Program, the provision of the population with housing, the production of consumer goods, the expansion of the service sphere, and the restructuring of the health service.

It is well known, that as a result of arbitrary actions and the phenomena of stagnation, questions of the supply of food, and especially meat products, to the population were not tackled in earnest for many years. Worse still, a mentality of dependance has taken root, an attitude based on the assumption that the state is rich enough to take care of everything has gained currency.

Life dictates that this attitude of dependence must be eradicated. In our present conditions there is no room for this. It must, irreversibly, become a matter of the past. However, initiative and a creative approach are the only ways to overcome this problem. Conditions have now been created for republics, krays, and oblasts to ensure their own supply of basic food products. The task now is to ensure a considerable increase in food production in every rayon, oblast, and republic within the shortest possible time.

The committee has focused special attention on enterprises' and peoples' subsidiary farms and plots of land. With the participation of people's control organs a study has been carried out in 100 of the country's regions.

What did this investigation reveal? Over the past 6 years in more than 50 percent of the regions under investigation, the numbers of cattle and hogs kept privately has decreased sharply. On more than 2 million of the more than 6 million investigated smallholdings—almost one-third of the country's total—no livestock is kept. Is it a surprise then that rural inhabitants come to cities to buy products?

Is it possible to improve the situation in the near future? The answer is yes. But only on condition that republic, oblast, rayon, kolkhoz, sovkhoz, and enterprise leaders attend personally and daily to questions of the development of subsidiary farms.

The production of food products on subsidiary farms can and must be increased. This is borne out by the experience of the successful solution of the food problem in a number of republics, krays, and oblasts which has been generalized by the USSR People's Control Committee. Some people may say that the generalization of economic experience is not really the control organs' job. I cannot agree with this. Neither the negative facts nor the positive phenomena which are taking place in our life can be passed over now. So, in conducting our control activities we will continue to study progressive experience and to take steps to ensure its wide dissemination.

Recently the Central Committee Politburo defined a package of measures to ensure the swift solution of the food question. In addition to the development of kolkhoz and sovkhoz production, the importance of the development of enterprises' and citizens' subsidiary farms and plots is especially emphasized. All unjustified restrictions and bans hampering this have been lifted. In their majority the rural population, and many city dwellers too, would like to work on the land, to have their own plot. What is needed is the skillful organization of this matter.

Another topical problem is the development of collective horticulture and vegetable-growing. An investigation carried out recently by people's control organs has revealed a multitude of bureaucratic obstacles in the path of the development of this necessary and important sphere. Around 5 million applications from the country's citizens have piled up at soviet ispolkoms. Sometimes it takes 8-10 years before they are dealt with. What kind of situation is this? Frequently the construction of summer houses, approach roads, the laying of electricity and water supply lines, and drainage are treated as insurmountable problems. People have great difficulties trying to buy construction materials, seedlings, and fertilizers. All this is discouraging city dwellers from growing vegetables and fruit.

The party Central Committee and the government have subjected this abnormal situation to a critical and principled assessment. The task has been set within 2-3 years to fully meet citizens applications for orchard and vegetable plots. The committee is currently conducting a comprehensive investigation into the organization by the USSR Gossnab, the Ministry of Trade, and the Tsentrosoyuz of sales of timber and other construction materials to the population.

An acute problem of the social sphere is the housing problem. The 27th Party Congress set the task of providing every family with a separate apartment or house by the year 2000. However, an investigation carried out in 70 oblasts, krays, and republics has shown that the pace of housing construction is considerably behind target. It is not just a matter of a shortage of funds and resources as leaders of soviet and economic organs frequently claim. Often ministries, departments, leaders of enterprises and organizations, and local organs who enthusiastically back the party and government decisions verbally, show little initiative in practice.

An example of this is the poor use of the capacity of large-panel house-building combines. There are 640 such enterprises in the country now. Their rated capacity is 68 million square meters of housing per year. However, it has been revealed that both last year and this year most of them have been working at only 70-80 percent—and in some oblasts only 50 percent or less—of their capacity. The situation is just as bad, if not worse, as regards the utilization of many brickworks and other construction material enterprises.

A big reserve for the acceleration of housing construction is the involvement in this matter of the funds and labor of the population itself. In Kazakhstan, in Gorkiy, Saratov, and Ulyanovsk Oblasts, and a number of other places, the future occupants help with the construction of houses in their free time. However, this positive experience has not yet been widely applied.

How else, if not as an oversight or a blunder on the part of control organs, among others, is the following sad fact to be explained: During the past 5-year plan the volume of individual and cooperative construction was less than half the volume achieved in the 6th 5-Year Plan, for instance. And that at a time when more than 1.5 million applications from working people to join housing cooperatives have piled up at enterprises and local soviet ispolkoms!

Added to this must be the numerous violations of legislation in the distribution of apartments. Injustice and abuses in these matters evoke special dissatisfaction and outrage among Soviet people. Neither can it be overlooked that despite the housing shortage, a considerable amount of space, especially at ground floor level is assigned to other than the intended purpose for various kinds of offices and other services. It is our task too to stop this from happening.

I would be possible to cite other examples of comprehensive, thorough investigations carried out in connection with a number of topical problems. However, the aforementioned investigations are of special importance.

The switch to key priority avenues of control has made it necessary for the committee and its organs at local level to completely reorganize all work, to look at problems in context rather than in isolation, and to investigate them comprehensively; to analyze and generalize the results of investigations in a broader socioeconomic context, and to act openly on the basis of complete glasnost. Touching upon glasnost I would like to say that the committee has

strengthened its ties with the editorial offices of central newspapers, television, and radio. Virtually all the materials that are discussed at our sessions on the results of investigations are passed on to the mass media. Work at local level must be organized along the same lines.

The USSR People's Control Committee is adopting measures to enhance the responsibility of people's control organs for the results of their work; it demands from them that they improve the organization of control with a view to enhancing the preventive aspect of their work and increasing its effectiveness. Recently we endorsed the experience of the Leningrad city committee which, in conditions of restructuring and expansion of democracy and glasnost, has begun to rely more extensively in its work on the opinion of labor collectives, and, where necessary, to address itself directly to the population.

We regard it as our task to critically analyze the work of people's control, to generalize its positive aspects, to glean bit by bit everything new that emerges in the practical work of people's control in the process of restructuring and to turn it into an asset of our whole system.

Now when a radical reform of economic management is under way and the whole economic mechanism is being restructured, the role and importance of objective and exacting control which watches over statewide interests is increased sharply.

In accordance with the instructions of the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum, preparations are under way for a radical restructuring of control work in the country. It is a question of creating an integrated system and defining the optimum structure and competence of control organs, the main avenues of their activity, and the principles governing their mutual relations with state organs and social organizations. In the course of these preparations we have held meetings with many party and soviet officials, economic managers, representatives of control organs, scientists, and public figures. Proposals submitted by working people have also been analyzed.

The recently adopted law has placed the enterprise and the labor collective at the focus of the restructuring effort. In the light of this, the problem of introducing order in control work directly at enterprises deserves particular attention. There is much work to be done here. Numerous standing commissions of party, trade union, Komsomol, and other social organizations and party control committees and groups are at the moment entrusted with identical control functions at enterprises. It can happen that up to half the labor collective at a plant or association is engaged in public formations called upon to carry out given control functions. Is this perhaps normal? Many investigations are being carried out taking tens and hundreds of people away from their job and there is no tangible benefit.

In this context the view is being expressed more and more frequently that it is necessary to concentrate the entire social control of the production, financial, and economic activity at enterprises in the hands of one organ—that is a people's control committee or group. However, in order to achieve this, its powers would have to be considerably extended. The labor collectives could elect their organ on the basis of delegating to it representatives from social organizations and production subdivisions. This solution seems most expedient because it would make it possible to bring together in a single control organ the most competent and principled people capable of conducting skilled and exacting control in conditions of self-management. At the same time it would make it possible to reduce the number of investigations. It goes without saying that the people's control committees and groups must work under the direct leadership of party organizations.

Now a few words about the need to reorganize departmental and interdepartmental control. The problem lies in the fact that the system of this type of control has developed under the influence of administrative methods of leadership. The desire of ministries and departments to deal with everything from above, to constantly meddle in the work of enterprises and organizations on any pretext, has largely determined the orientation of control toward organizing as many checks and investigations as possible, to collect all kind of information—often quite useless information—with little concern for the practical effects of all this. This practice is now in direct conflict with the demands of restructuring.

In accordance with the Central Committee Plenum demands it will be necessary to radically reduce the control apparatus, to embark on a sensible merger or amalgamation of individual control organs and to abolish those that are superfluous. The following figures illustrate how ponderous, cumbersome, and overgrown this apparatus has become. More than 330,000 people are employed in the organs of interdepartmental and departmental control. The returns from the work of these control and auditing workers is often negligible. There have been frequent cases where after departmental investigations which revealed nothing, people's control workers exposed serious violations and abuses. Incidentally, only 14,000 people are employed in people's control organs.

At the same time, it is necessary to thoroughly establish order in the organization of investigations, inspections, and audits carried out by interdepartmental control organs and to ensure the necessary coordination in this work. If people's control committees were reinforced and invested with the necessary powers, they could take over this coordination at all levels. This would provide the organizational basis for a truly comprehensive approach to control and stem the flood of unjustified and unnecessary investigations.

Creating an integrated control system on the basis of the USSR People's Control Committee also marks a new step in the direction of investing people's control with more extensive powers in the struggle against violations of state discipline and legality and putting an end to all kind of abuses. In this matter it is necessary to strengthen links with prosecutor's offices, arbitration, and other law enforcement organs. At the same time, the responsibility of people's control organs for the task with which they have been entrusted must be enhanced. Only politically educated, competent, energetic, and enterprising people with a broad horizon and good economic knowledge capable of creative, analytical work, and willing and able to uphold matters of statewide importance should be nominated to these organs.

Life and the interests of restructuring have raised the question of freeing people's control organs from all kinds of local influences, protecting them against any attempt to infringe their rights, or put pressure on them with the aim of sheltering culprits. The militant and principled stance of people's control must have the active backing of party organizations and local organs of power.

The need for constant party leadership of people's control and its close relationship with the party was regarded by V.I. Lenin as a most important precondition for control ability to discharge its role in the socialist society and to act as a reliable tool in the hands of the state in the struggle for the victory of the new social system. This Leninist idea has once again demonstrated its unshakable vitality at the present stage of the development of the Soviet society.

Economic

Resolution on Price Restructuring

PM291031 Moscow SOBRANIYE POSTANOVLENIY PRAVITELSTVA SSSR: OTDEL in Russian No 36, 1987 pp 763-775

[CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers Resolution No 819, dated 17 July 1987: "On the Basic Guidelines for Restructuring the Pricing System Under the Conditions of the New Economic Mechanism"; boldface passages as published]

[Text] In accordance with the decisions of the 27th party congress and the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum on radically restructuring economic management it is necessary to effect a radical reform of pricing and transform prices into an effective instrument for accelerating socioeconomic development, increasing social production efficiency, making extensive use of economic methods of management, and strengthening economic accountability [khozyaystvennyy raschet].

The existing pricing system emerged under the conditions of the extensive development of the economy and has accumulated major shortcomings and disproportions which have led to a decline in the role of prices as an active economic lever in the leadership of the national economy. In practice prices performed basically accounting functions and did not create conditions for improving the economic mechanism and increasing the efficiency of production and resource saving.

Prices for many types of output do not reflect socially necessary expenditure on their production and sale, do not take the consumer characteristics and quality of products fully into account, and do not exert a regulatory influence on the balance between supply and demand. They have an extremely weak influence on improving output quality, accelerating scientific and technical progress, and renewing production capital and are not utilized effectively enough to promote the achievement of high end results by enterprises and associations.

The established approach to pricing is based to a considerable extent on the principle of reimbursing enterprises' individual expenditures and enables them to obtain profit which does not depend on the efficiency of economic management. This creates the possibility of and a direct interest in overstating prices, creates conditions for reporting increased value levels and improved assessment indicators without actually increasing output or production efficiency, and retards the implementation of the course aimed at implementing a policy of thrift.

The principle of managing the price system as a unified whole was violated, and serious disproportions were allowed in the level of wholesale, purchase, and retail prices for many types of output and charges for services, which led to unjustified contradictions between general state interests and the financially autonomous [khozraschetnyy] interests of associations and enterprises.

Economically unjustified approaches to pricing led to the emergence and rapid growth of subsidies on the production and sale of the most diverse types of products and services.

Considerably deficiencies occurred in the level of wholesale prices for industrial and food products. This was one of the substantive reasons for the disproportion between supply and demand on the goods and services market, the formation of losses in the national economy, the artificial shortage of some products and restrictions on demand for others, and the sale of a number of products at excessively high prices and it also led to negative phenomena in the sphere of circulation and a decline in the purchasing power of the ruble.

The system of prices took shape to a considerable extent in isolation from the level of world prices and did not take account of the country's economic interest in making efficient use of the international division of labor and and advantages of the socialist economic integration of the CEMA countries, which made it difficult to correctly assess the efficiency of foreign economic ties and distorted their actual results.

The USSR State Committee for Prices and its local organs did not pursue a policy of intensifying the role of prices and charges in managing the economy and improving the economic mechanism and concentrated their activity on resolving second-priority tasks.

Unjustified centralization in setting prices and rates for the overwhelming majority of types of output, goods, and services became established in pricing practice. This approach in effect excluded consumers from the pricing process, lessened the demands on the producers of output, and resulted in bureaucracy and delay in setting prices, an irresponsible attitude to their elaboration on the part of many ministries and departments, and also numerous instances of the approval of unsubstantiated price levels and violations of state discipline in the application of prices.

Under the new conditions of economic management the underestimation of the role of pricing in managing the national economy must be resolutely ended.

In order to bring the system of prices into line with the present-day demands of national economic development and transform pricing into an effective lever for the implementation of the party's economic and social policy the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolve that:

1. A radical reform of the pricing system and integrated restructuring of wholesale, purchase, and retail prices and charges as a unified whole are to be implemented. The principal task of the restructuring is to be considered the creation of a qualitatively new system of prices oriented toward the intensification of social production, the widespread utilization of economic methods of management, and the strengthening of economic accountability and self-financing with a view to accelerating the country's socioeconomic development.

The system of prices must become an objective yardstick of labor expenditure and the results of economic activity and an important factor in shaping progressive proportions in the development of the national economy, molding the structure of the population's effective demand, and increasing their real incomes.

The reform of prices is intended to improve the situation in the national economy and create better conditions for struggling for production efficiency, resource saving, and output quality.

2. The restructuring of pricing at the present stage of economic development is to proceed from the following fundamental requirements:

Ensuring that prices consistently reflect socially necessary expenditure on the production and sale of output, the consumer characteristics and quality of the product, and the effective demand for it and take fuller account of payments for labor and natural resources and expenditure on environmental protection;

Giving prices a cost-cutting function and increasing their incentive role in accelerating scientific and technical progress, improving output quality, creating new equipment, saving resources, reducing the materials- and energy-intensiveness of output, and ensuring the utilization of low-waste and waste-free technologies;

Switching to the planning of prices and charges as a component part of 5-year plans with a view to ensuring that prices more fully reflect the tasks and conditions of national economic development during the plan period and achieving stability in economic normatives;

Ensuring the economic preconditions for a balance of physical and value proportions in the national economy and reducing excessive redistribution processes and unjustifiably large subsidies;

Creating economically sound conditions for increasing the effectiveness of economic accountability and self-financing in all sectors of the national economy and applying on a broad scale the principle of paying for production capital and labor, natural, and other resources;

Overcoming the tendency toward increases in prices on the basis of the development of socialist competition, enterprise competitiveness, the elimination of shortages and monopolies of any kind, and consumer pressure on the producer;

Ensuring democratization and an optimum combination of stability and flexibility in setting prices for goods and services on the basis of the widespread utilization of economic methods while at the same time intensifying centralized principles in the management of the entire pricing process;

Substantially increasing the role of the consumer in determining prices and organizing effective monitoring of the correctness and validity of the establishment and application of prices at all levels of economic management;

Ensuring that wholesale price policy is in keeping with the tasks of increasing the population's real incomes and implementing the principles of social justice more fully.

3. With a view to bringing the system of prices into line with the demands of the new economic mechanism and intensifying the influence of prices and charges on the growth of social production efficiency, the entire system of prices and charges is to be subjected to the speediest revision making it possible to use these prices and charges as the basis for elaborating the economic and social development plan for the 13th 5-Year Plan period

and ensuring the comprehensive utilization of the principles of full economic accountability and self-financing in all sectors of the national economy.

New wholesale prices for industrial output and charges for transport and communication services are to be elaborated and implemented as of 1 January 1990, and new projected prices and estimates in capital construction and purchase prices in agriculture as of 1 January 1991.

4. The following should be the point of departure when revising **wholesale prices in industry**:

The new prices must reflect socially necessary expenditure and make fuller provision for live labor, raw materials, and natural resources and also expenditure on environmental protection, social insurance, and cadres' vocational training. Prices must be shaped in accordance with the national economy's development prospects for the 13th 5-Year Plan period and make allowance for reductions in production costs and the acceleration of labor productivity growth. Economically unjustified losses and profitability variations in the production and sale of output must be eliminated, and state subsidies must be reduced to the minimum;

There must be an improvement in the correlation of wholesale prices for output from extractive and processing sectors, interchangeable types of fuel (coal, gas, fuel oil, gasoline, and diesel fuel), ferrous and nonferrous metals, plastics, natural and synthetic materials, timber products, construction materials, and other interchangeable types of industrial output. The new wholesale prices must fully reflect the national economic efficiency of the utilization of modern scientific and technical achievements, the saving of natural resources, and the reclaiming of secondary types of raw material, fuel, and energy. Coal industry losses in the sector as a whole must be eliminated. Prices for fuel and raw material resources must take account of the intensification of resource saving and become stable before the year 2000. The necessary differentiation of prices between mining areas taking mining and geological conditions into account must be ensured;

Wholesale prices for machine building output must be set proceeding from the need to encourage the updating of the product range and develop and introduce fundamentally new generations of equipment, systems of machines and mechanisms matching the best world models, robotized complexes, and complex power industry and other equipment. Economically substantiated value correlationships for analogous and functionally similar industrial output must be established. The economic interest which enterprises and associations have in producing a more finished product must be increased. An unjustified increase in prices without a substantial improvement in the technical and economic parameters and efficiency of the new output must not be allowed. Wholesale prices for basic types of electronic equipment and also individual types of output from instrument making and other high-technology production processes ensuring the widespread automation and electronicization of sectors of the national economy must be reduced;

When determining the wholesale prices for new machine building output there must be an increase in the responsibility which design planning organizations and clients bear for the development and introduction of effective technical options and in their interest in achieving this. As scientific research and design planning organizations switch to working under the conditions of self-financing it is deemed expedient to establish contract prices for the end product of their activity—the results of scientific research, design planning, and technological work; scientific and technical services relating to the introduction of these results; and other types of analogous work. The level of these prices is determined by the client and the contractor depending on the effectiveness and quality of the scientific and technical output and the time taken to complete the work;

Wholesale prices for industrial consumer goods and food products must make provision for a substantial increase in the interest which manufacturing enterprises have in producing a broader and more diverse range of high-quality products and for the reduction of unjustified redistribution processes and the scale of state subsidies;

There must be an economically substantiated narrowing of the gap between prices for various groups and types of output and world prices, with the technical and economic parameters and quality of the output being taken into account here; and conditions must be created for the extensive development of mutually advantageous foreign economic ties on the basis of progressive shifts in foreign trade patterns and production shaping and specialization.

There is to be a substantial increase in the level of scientific, technical, and economic substantiation of prices for new and highly efficient types of product. The current practice of adding to wholesale prices temporary incentive increments governed by a special distribution procedure is to be abandoned, and the new wholesale price levels are to take account of the efficiency of the production and utilization of the output. The application of discounts on wholesale prices for output certified as being in the prime quality category is to be retained.

When revising wholesale prices their level is to be determined primarily on the basis of the efficiency, quality, technical and economic parameters, and consumer characteristics of the product, and the utilization of initial actual expenditure as the main basis for determining prices is to be abandoned.

It is deemed impermissible to use the pricing mechanism in order to increase prices unjustifiably so that associations, enterprises, and organizations can obtain profit (income) not related to the real contribution of the labor

collectives to the end results of their economic activity. Prices and charges are not to take account of increased expenditure resulting from technical laggardness, or from shortcomings in the organization of production or thriftlessness.

5. A review of **charges for freight shipments** is to be carried out with a view to ensuring the efficient utilization of all components of the transportation system in the national economy, the rationalization of shipments, and the reduction of transportation costs on this basis. Economic conditions are to be created for the optimum distribution of freight among the various types of transport and shipments are to be made equally advantageous for various types of freight over different distances, with a view to ensuring a better service for consumers and eliminating losses made on shipments of particular types of freight.

The role of charges is to be stepped up in providing incentives for the introduction into the country's transportation system of new, high-efficiency means of transportation and progressive ways of delivering freight which ensure a high degree of freight preservation, and for the fullest possible utilization of the lifting and carrying capacity of transportation facilities.

Provision is to be made for the possibility of using charges to create economic interest for the reorientation of freight flows depending on the situation taking shape in the national economy and the emergence of new technical solutions in freight transportation as a result of scientific and technical progress.

6. **Projected prices and estimates in capital construction** are to be revised in the direction of intensifying their role in enhancing the efficiency of capital investments and improving the work of planning and construction organizations. The mechanism for shaping prices in construction is to be restructured to exclude the unwarranted influence of materials-intensiveness on the level of prices for finished construction products.

Conditions are to be created for the broad application of contract projected prices to finished projects and other end products of construction. Contract prices are to be differentiated depending on the quality of the construction product.

7. **Purchase prices for agricultural products** are to be revised proceeding from the following principles:

The level of purchase prices is to be determined proceeding from the average socially necessary costs of production and the preferential encouragement of the basic types of products in the most favorable regions of specialized commodity production, as well as the prospects of reducing production prime costs on the basis of introducing intensive technology and progressive labor organization. At the same time, high costs associated with a low standard of farm management must not be taken into account;

Further improvement in the zonal differentiation of purchase prices is to be ensured by consolidating zones with due regard to the most rational distribution of agricultural production;

Rent payments are to be introduced for kolkhozes and sovkhozes under relatively more favorable conditions, with the provision that these payments go to set up a special fund of the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee. This fund's assets are to be directed toward strengthening the material and technical base of farms operating under worse conditions, and the current system of using budget funds to establish markups on prices for products from low-profitability and loss-making farms is to be abolished;

More complete differentiation of purchase prices depending on quality is to be provided for. Prices are to be used to encourage storage of agricultural products directly on kolkhozes and sovkhozes;

The flexibility of purchase prices for fruits, vegetables, and other types of plant products is to be enhanced, and their seasonal differentiation is to be extended to take fuller account of labor expenditure and to satisfy the requirements for these products during the year;

There is to be a transition to selling equipment, mineral fertilizers, and other industrial products to agriculture at wholesale prices, with a view to abolishing the preferential procedure for selling them, so as to have an economic impact on improving the utilization of tractors, agricultural machinery, mineral fertilizers, and other industrial products on kolkhozes and sovkhozes;

Payment for water is to be introduced, and it is to be taken into account in purchase prices to encourage more economical and rational use of water by kolkhozes and sovkhozes and to enhance the efficiency of funds invested by the state in reclamation.

It is to be considered expedient, in the long term, to radically revise the system of shaping purchase prices for agricultural products. To this end a gradual transition is to be made to the use of contract and accounting prices for agricultural products in relations between enterprises and organizations of the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee system—prices determined proceeding from the existing wholesale and retail prices for corresponding end products of the agro-industrial complex. At the same time, contract and accounting prices must be determined with due regard to the enterprises' actual contribution and the extent of their involvement in producing, processing, and selling agricultural products.

8. It is to be deemed necessary to prepare for and implement the restructuring of **retail prices and charges** and bring them into line with socially necessary production costs, the consumer properties and quality of products, and market requirements. Taking into account the exceptionally great social significance of retail prices, we are to proceed from the premise that a change to them must not only not lead to a deterioration in working people's living standards but, on the contrary, must lead to a rise in these standards for certain categories of working people and to fuller realization of social justice.

Prices are to be used to encourage extending and updating the range of goods. Measures are to be taken to eliminate unsubstantiated differences in price levels for individual groups of industrial goods, and a differentiated approach to price setting is to be ensured with due regard to the income and aspirations of individual social and age groups of the population.

The practice of setting contract prices for nonfood goods, the demand for which is satisfied in full, as well as for prestige, particularly fashionable and other goods in increased demand is to be extended, while at the same time taking account of the population's needs and the state's interests.

As the market becomes saturated with foodstuffs and industrial goods, as shortages are eliminated, and as adequate commodity and financial resources are accumulated, retail prices are to be reduced with due regard to the market conditions and public demand.

With a view to accelerating the development of paid services and considerably improving their quality, a comprehensive system of measures is to be implemented to improve pricing for services rendered to the population. Differentiation of prices and charges for services is to be stepped up depending on their quality and social significance, with the orientation here toward accessibility of mass kinds of paid services for all sections of the population.

All major changes to retail prices and charges affecting the population's living standards must be made the object of broad discussion in the country.

9. Guided by this resolution, the USSR State Prices Committee, the USSR Gosplan, the USSR Gosstroy, the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee, and the USSR Ministry of Finance, with the participation of the AUCCTU and interested ministries and departments, are to submit to the USSR Council of Ministers proposals for a revision of prices in the national economy.

10. It is to be considered necessary, on the basis of observing the unified statewide demands on price shaping, to ensure the democratization of the pricing process and the more flexible combination of centralized principles in price setting with the broadening of the rights of USSR ministries and departments, union and autonomous republic councils of ministers, local soviet ispolkoms, associations, enterprises, and organizations in determining prices and charges.

In connection with the development of economic methods of management and in accordance with the new economic mechanism, it is to be deemed necessary to apply the following prices and charges:

prices and charges set in a centralized manner;

contract prices and charges;

prices and charges set independently by enterprises and organizations.

Prices and charges set in a centralized manner for products, goods, and services are approved, depending on their national economic and social significance, by the USSR Council of Ministers, the USSR State Prices Committee, ministries and departments, union and autonomous republic councils of ministers, and local soviet ispolkoms. For the most important products such prices are determined together with the elaboration of the all-state plan.

Contract prices and charges are set by ministries, departments, and manufacturing enterprises by agreement with the consumers for production and technical products manufactured in accordance with single and individual orders, for new products or products being assimilated for the first time, for new nonfood consumer goods, and also for individual kinds of food goods sold by associations and enterprises by agreement with trading organizations for a period of up to 2 years according to a list defined by the USSR State Prices Committee, for the end products of scientific research and planning and design organizations, for agricultural products purchased from the population, for products purchased and sold by cooperative organizations, and for other kinds of products (work, services) envisaged by legislation.

Independently set prices and charges are approved by enterprises, organizations, and cooperatives for production and technical products, agricultural products, consumer goods, and services to which prices approved in a centralized manner do not apply, as well as for products and services for their own consumption or sold in their own trade network.

It is to be laid down that, as full economic accountability , self-financing, wholesale trade in the means of production, and direct economic ties develop, the sphere of application of contract prices and also independently approved prices will be extended.

11. The role of pricing is to be intensified in enhancing the efficiency of foreign economic ties, expanding international collaboration and, above all, mutually advantageous specialization and collaboration with CEMA

countries, and creating interest in the development of new forms of international production, economic, scientific, and technical cooperation.

In improving the system of contract prices [kontraktnyye tseny] [this is the only paragraph in which "kontraktnyye tseny" is the vernacular for "contract prices"; elsewhere "dogovornyye tseny" is used] we are to proceed from the need to bring them closer to the level and proportions of world prices while, at the same time, observing the principle of mutual advantage. World prices for corresponding products are, as a rule, to be used as the base for contract [kontraktnyy] prices in foreign economic ties with CEMA countries. In setting contract [kontraktnyy] prices for machinery and equipment on the basis of world market prices, their actual amendment depending on the quality and the technical standard of the corresponding products is to be ensured. The setting of firm contract [kontraktnyy] prices, as a rule, for the whole term of the contract is to be envisaged.

In the case of reciprocal deliveries of subassemblies and components within the framework of production sharing on the basis of direct ties or the activity of joint enterprises, as well as international associations and organizations, contract prices based on the price of the end product are to be used.

12. In connection with the increased importance of pricing in the new economic mechanism, it is deemed necessary to step up the role of the USSR State Committee for Prices as the organ responsible for the implementation of state price policy.

The avenues and forms of the committee's activity are to be changed radically and the scientific, economic, and organizational standard of pricing work in the national economy is to be improved.

The following are to be considered the most important tasks of the USSR State Committee for Prices: comprehensively improving the entire price system, strenghtening its links with measures in restructuring the economic mechanism, substantially improving methodological and analytical work, and increasing promptness in resolving questions of pricing in full accordance with the requirements of the USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association).

There is to be a stepping up of the responsibility of the USSR State Committee for Prices and other pricing organs for the economic justification of the prices set, compliance with state price discipline, and the drawing up and implementation of measures to improve the system of prices and charges.

Pricing organs are to create the conditions for the development of progressive new methods of economic management, the widening of the socialist spirit of enterprise, and the stepping up of the economic responsibility of associations, enterprises, and organizations for achieving high end results in their activity.

13. The USSR State Committee for Prices and its local organs:

Must improve radically the work of monitoring the well founded formation and correct application of prices in the national economy, create an integrated social and state system of price monitoring and place it on a regular plan footing, and improve the coordination of the activity of pricing organs and public organizations on questions of the monitoring of compliance with state price discipline;

Must change considerably the methods of monitoring through the use of profound socioeconomic analysis of pricing processes, price dynamics, and changes in price structure;

Must step up monitoring of compliance with retail prices and charges for services for the population;

Must remove economically unjustified prices set by ministries, departments, associations, and enterprises and apply the economic sanctions laid down by the USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association) in the event of the violation of state price discipline.

Violations of state price discipline are to be regarded as equivalent to overstatements in state reports.

14. In accordance with the new tasks and functions, the organizational structure of the USSR State Committee for Prices central apparatus is to be revised. There is to be a substantial increase in the role of composite economic subunits for the national economic complexes, and strictly specialized departments are to be abolished.

The USSR State Committee for Prices is to be instructed radically to restructure the work style and methods of pricing organs in line with the new economic management conditions. Formalism and bureaucracy in the practice of considering and approving prices are to be resolutely stopped, and there is to be greater reliance on economic and technical justifications and firm resistance to all attempts to apply a departmental or parochial approach to pricing questions.

Measures are to be adopted to strengthen the cadres of pricing organs and improve the whole system of improving the qualifications of workers on these organs.

The USSR State Committee for Prices is to ensure that its activity is closely linked with other central economic departments and permanent organs of the USSR Council of Ministers. It is necessary to include among the members of the committee representatives of the USSR Gosplan, USSR Ministry of Finance, USSR State Committee for Statistics, and AUCCTU.

With a view to strengthening the ties between pricing organs and scientific research institutes and economic VUZ's, it is to be laid down that the USSR State Committee for Prices Scientific Research Institute for Pricing is the leading scientific institution for carrying out scientific research in the sphere of prices and charges and, in conjunction with the USSR Academy of Sciences, coordinates scientific research work on pricing problems in the country. It is deemed expedient to organize the publication of a periodical journal, *Tsenoobrazovaniye V SSSR* [*Pricing in the USSR*].

15. Party, soviet, economic, and trade union organs, guided by the decision of the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum, are to ensure the efficient organization of all work on restructuring the price system, increasing the role of prices in the economic mechanism, and making prices an active tool in the implementation of the party's economic strategy. The content and significance of measures in the sphere of improving pricing are to be publicized widely.

M. Gorbachev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee

N. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers
Moscow, Kremlin. 17 July 1987, No 820.

Agricultural

Kazakhstan Grain Shipped for Drying

PM291337 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Sep 87 Morning Edition p 1

[I. Abakumov report: "How To Reduce the Line to the Elevator"]

[Excerpts] The USSR Ministry of Grain Products has adopted a decision to transport about 2 million tonnes of damp grain from Kazakhstan's northern oblasts to other regions of the republic or the country where there are facilities to dry the grain. [passage omitted]

How eagerly was this decision awaited in Kazakhstan! After all, no one could have foreseen a situation whereby all the grain arriving at the elevators had to be fed through the driers. Damp grain suddenly started arriving from all farms. There were hundreds of trucks waiting in line for 5-6 hours to unload at the elevators. The nerves of drivers and grain threshing floor operators were stretched to the limit—the self-warming of grain could begin at any moment, and that would be a disaster beyond comparison with any other calamity. But what could be done while one grain dryer could handle just 50 tonnes of grain per hour!

"There is a way out," I was told by V. Korchuganov, director of Kustanay Oblast's Koskulskiy Elevator. "I sent a telegram to the Oblast Grain Products Administration, asking permission to transport any grain of above-normative dampness wherever drying facilities are available. We could double the enterprise's handling capacity if we were to stop drying the grain to the 15-percent dampness according to regulations, but at most to 19-20 percent. Such grain could then be transported in railroad cars without any fears about quality. There is not a day to be lost."

This was also claimed by specialists at many elevators and farms where I called in the last few days. Now it is not a matter of instructions, people said, the already threshed grain could perish. The only salvation involves transporting it elsewhere; there is no other way out. These conclusions required no proof: I saw with my own eyes the sprouts from grain that had gotten stuck in the cracks of dumpers' bodies. Can there be anything more dramatic than the picture of green shoots sprouting from steel?

"A joint telegram from us and the Ministry of Railways was sent to North Kazakhstan authorizing the transportation of grain with dampness of up to 22 percent," V. Anikin, USSR deputy minister of grain products, announced. "It laid down the transportation routes and the freight consignees. The drying of the virgin lands' grain will be completed at elevators in Bashkiria, Tataria, and Kuybyshev, Tyumen, Sverdlovsk, and several other oblasts."

There is no doubt that the situation at the virgin lands' elevators will now improve. But do such emergency solutions eliminate the question of the need to develop grain dryers to specifically meet the conditions in North Kazakhstan? The series-produced units are not powerful enough. People in the virgin lands have learned to adapt them themselves to meet the requirements, but is this the right way out? [passage omitted]

Dhzambul Oblast Grain Sale Figures Reported

PM291131 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Sep 87 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Grain in Excess of Plan"]

[Text] Dzhambul, 26 Sep—having completed the harvesting in the oblast's mountain regions, Dzhambul's grain growers have started grain shipments counting toward the third annual plan for grain sales to the state. The application of intensive technologies in the cultivation of cereal crops and the introduction of advanced methods of labor and soil protection systems enabled the crop farmers to gather 23 quintals of grain per hectare—50 percent more than last year. A. Kudaybergenov's contractual link from Dzhambulskiy Rayon's N. Krupskaya Kolkhoz was judged to be one of the best collectives. They obtained 68 quintals of grain per hectare there. Dzhambul's crop farmers have delivered more than 789,000 tonnes of grain to the state granaries against a planned amount of 393,000 tonnes.

Central Committee Resolution on Food Program

PM301001 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Sep 87 Second Edition p 1,2

[Unattributed report under the general heading "In the CPSU Central Committee": "The CPSU Central Committee Has Adopted the Resolution 'On Urgent Measures To Accelerate the Solution of the Food Question in Accordance with the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum Guidelines'"]

[Text] The resolution notes that the work being done in accordance with the decisions of the 27th party congress and the CPSU Central Committee May (1982) and April (1985) plenums on assimilating the new economic management mechanism and intensive techniques in the agro-industrial complex are having a positive effect on increasing labor collectives' interest in end results and helping to increase the return on investments. In the past year the increase in agricultural gross output was 5 percent, which corresponds to the growth rate envisaged for the current 5-year plan. The number of loss-making kolkhozes and sovkhozes has been reduced, their profitability has increased, and for the first time in recent years costs per unit of output have fallen.

At the same time, as the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum noted, the great potential that exists for rapidly increasing the food supply is far from fully utilized. The rate of growth of agricultural gross output in Tajikistan, Armenia, and Novgorod, Chelyabinsk, and Amur Oblasts is two-three times below the sector's average. The stagnation in Uzbekistan's agrarian economy has not been eliminated.

Many oblasts in the RSFSR and the Ukraine are lagging considerably behind the Food Program's targets in grain production, as is Moldavia in the production of oleaginous plants, and Kazakhstan and Lithuania in meat production.

Substantial shortcomings in the social development of the countryside are having an adverse effect on the solution of food problems. Despite a 40 percent increase in capital investments for these purposes in the past 4 years the amount of housing commissioned per resident in the countryside is considerably lower than in cities. There is a serious lag in the provision of amenities, the development of the medical, cultural, and consumer services network, and hard-surfaced road building.

Factors continue to operate which are slowing down the development of the economic activeness and independence of labor collectives and cramping the population's initiative. Insufficient use is being made of economic levers for regulating production, normative methods of planning are being assimilated too slowly, and contractual relations are not being developed properly. Supplements added to purchase prices for produce sold by kolkhozes and sovkhozes making either a low profit or a loss are often used primarily as labor remuneration. Excessive administration and the rigid regulation of the activity of farms, enterprises, and organizations have still not been eliminated.

Union and local planning and economic organs have been underrating the importance of accelerating the development of the processing base for resolving the food problem.

The CPSU Central Committee instructs union republic Communist Party Central Committees and Councils of Ministers, kraykoms, obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms, ASSR Councils of Ministers, soviet ispolkoms, economic organs, and trade union, Komsomol, and other social organizations to formulate and implement in accordance with the demands of the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum urgent measures to ensure a further considerable improvement in the food supply in each rayon, city, oblast, kray, and autonomous and union republic.

It is proposed to comprehensively expand and deepen the processes of democratization, to develop the initiative of the labor collectives of the agro-industrial complex and the enterprises and organizations of other ministries and departments, the rural population, and all citizens, and to boost their interest in increasing food resources. Guided by Lenin's ideas on cooperation, they are to embark more boldly on new forms and methods of economic management and with those aims in mind to resolutely eliminate all the obstacles and restrictions preventing an increase in the production of agricultural output both on kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and the subsidi- plots of industrial enterprises and in the individual sector. The work experience of those party organizations which under the new economic management conditions have rapidly achieved a considerable increase in the production of agricultural output, fulfilled the plan targets for supplies to centralized funds, and secured a noticeable improvement in local supplies should be consistently supported and disseminated. At the same time it is necessary to resolutely eliminate parasitism, the desire of some leaders to work below full capacity, and the attempt to make up for food shortages resulting from omissions in their own work at the state's expense.

It is deemed necessary to sharply increase the return on the resources invested in land reclamation and thereby to achieve a quick and significant increase in the food supply. The USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee, the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources, and union republic Councils of Ministers are instructed to establish the proper order in this important work, to prevent the inefficient investment of resources, and to use them in the light of the paramount needs of kolkhozes and sovkhozes in the interests of producing extra output and strengthening their economies.

The earliest possible attainment of a significant increase in the food supply growth rate by the comprehensive use of all food sources is regarded by the CPSU Central Committee as the most important and central task of the party's policy. It is necessary here to proceed from the premise that the accelerated development of social production in the agrarian sector of the economy is a reliable foundation for resolving the food question in the country and is also a good basis for making the fullest possible use of the potential of the subsidiary plots belonging to enterprises and citizens and other sources of obtaining additional output.

To intensify the influence of economic management methods on the agricultural production growth rate and to prompt labor collectives to make the most efficient use of their production potential, the CPSU Central Committee instructs the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee and ministries and departments belonging to the agro-industrial complex to complete the transfer of all subordinate kolkhozes and sovkhozes and other enterprises and organizations to full economic accountability and self-financing in 1988-1989.

Planning and financial organs and agro-industrial committees and associations are instructed to provide methods for regulating economic relationships within the agro-industrial complex which ensure expanded reproduction on farms, enterprises, and organizations chiefly by means of their own resources. Special attention is to be paid here to fixing purchase prices which cover socially necessary costs and provide an incentive for improving output quality, increasing labor productivity, and reducing costs. Work to improve planning, finance, labor organization and remuneration, and the democratization of management is to continue.

Every enterprise and organization should transfer to the new conditions of economic management in the light of the actual situation that is taking shape and the demands of economic accountability, and expenditure should be in strict accord with their own money revenue and the deadline for loan repayment. The consumerist approach to the use of credits for labor remuneration not backed up by real output must end. It is proposed that a program for improving the financial state of kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other agro-industrial complex enterprises and associations be drawn up within 3 months.

The CPSU Central Committee demands that party committees and soviet and economic organs complete the transfer of all production subunits to contractual forms of labor organization in 1988. In so doing, the maximum account is to be taken of the full diversity of conditions when selecting the forms and methods of the contract, and formalism, inertia, and stereotyped working in this important matter are to be resolutely eradicated. Comprehensive support must be given to production collectives which take out a long-term (10-15 year) lease on means of production and work as true stewards of the land.

The attention of party, soviet, and economic leaders is drawn to existing cases of an incorrect attitude and prejudice toward the family and individual contract and the failure to appreciate the great potential that they contain. Effective measures are to be taken to ensure the broad application of these organizational forms. Labor remuneration for all participants in production, including leaders and specialists, is to be made directly dependent on gross income and other forms of production incentives are to be used as well. The proportion of remuneration in kind for agricultural workers is to be increased according to a scale linked strictly to end results.

The CPSU Central Committee believes that the complete assimilation of economic accountability and contractual forms of labor organization in conjunction with the intensification of crop farming, stockraising, and the processing industry and the attainment on this basis of a considerable improvement in the population's food supply are the most important criteria for assessing the restructuring that is being carried out in the agro-industrial complex.

The resolution notes that it is necessary to continue to widely utilize the potential of industrial, construction, transport, and other enterprises in cities to overcome the lag in the economic and social development of the countryside. City enterprises and organizations are called upon to actively take part in consolidating the material base of kolkhozes and sovkhozes, especially those located in remote areas, in helping to build housing, schools, preschool and medical establishments, cultural and consumer facilities, and roads in the countryside, and to provide rural population centers with public utilities and amenities. This work is to be carried out on a contract basis and to involve the workforce and means of both enterprises and the farms themselves.

The CPSU Central Committee instructs party, soviet, and economic organs in the center and at local level to focus efforts on the speediest possible solution of a task of statewide importance—the accelerated development and retooling of the processing industry—in order to obtain the biggest possible real increase in the production of quality food products through better processing and improved storage of agricultural produce. In their practical work planning, financial, agro-industrial, and other economic organs must proceed from the fact that at present and in the near future the development of the processing sphere is the most economical and swift way of obtaining additional food and thus ensuring an increase in the country's national income.

In view of the importance of accelerating the solution of this problem, the CPSU Central Committee has instructed the USSR Council of Ministers to draw up and submit within 2 months proposals for the additional production in 1988-1995 of equipment for agricultural

produce processing and storage enterprises. It is deemed necessary to involve enterprises of all the national economic sectors in the solution of this task.

The resolution makes provision for radically improving the work of the Tsentrosoyuz and its organs at local level in procuring agricultural product surpluses from the population and from kolkhozes and sovkhozes, organizing the processing of these surpluses at its enterprises for its own purposes and also as a service to customers [na davalcheskoy osnove], and improving its supply and marketing activities. In order to improve the organization of the procurement, processing, and marketing of livestock, milk, fruit, vegetables, and wild berries and mushrooms and to expand the services for the inhabitants of villages and workers' settlements, it is deemed necessary to follow up proposals from local level to create an extensive network of trade, procurement, and processing enterprises on a cooperative basis.

With a view to developing economic initiative, enhancing glasnost in management, and eliminating administration by decree in the leadership of kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and processing, construction, and other subdivisions, it is deemed expedient to further improve the activity of agro-industrial organs, especially at rayon level. Here it is necessary to make extensive use of positive experience whereby the rayon agro-industrial association should be headed by a council elected at a meeting (conference) of representatives of kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other enterprises and chaired by one of the most authoritative farm leaders. The association's working apparatus must be accountable to the council.

Party committees and soviet and economic organs are instructed to support and disseminate in every way the new, promising formations in the agro-industrial complex such as the agro-industrial combines and associations, agrifirms, and production (science-and-production) systems which make it possible to accelerate the introduction of the achievements of scientific and technical progress, achieve closer integration of production, processing, storage, and marketing of products, reduce losses, and get the products to the consumer more quickly.

Union republic Communist Party Central Committees and kraykoms, obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms are instructed, guided by the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum, to resolutely improve work in selecting, placing, and training cadres and staffing kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other agro-industrial complex enterprises with ideologically mature and competent leaders and specialists. Constant care must be taken to enhance the standing of kolkhoz chairmen and enterprise directors, to form a stable detachment of farm and enterprise leaders, and to protect them against outside interference in affairs within their sphere of competence and against unjustified fines and other sanctions. Paramount importance must be attached to the training of cadres at all levels which must be continuous and ensure a profound assimilation of modern methods of management.

Attention is drawn to the need to enhance moral incentives for agro-industrial complex workers for the successful solution of tasks in ensuring the country's food supply. It has been decided that it would be expedient for the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to draw up conditions and a procedure for nominating workers from agriculture and allied sectors for state prizes for the achievement of targets, set for each zone, in agro-industrial production and specific contributions to the development of the social sphere.

The CPSU Central Committee has instructed the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee and the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education to ensure a quality improvement in the training of specialists in higher and secondary specialized agricultural educational establishments, close linkage between the educational and training process and modern methods of practical production management, and in-depth assimilation by students and pupils of the economic mechanism of management, intensive techniques, the latest achievements of scientific and technical progress, and management skills in conditions of expanded rights and independence of farms and enterprises and their switch to full economic accountability and self-financing.

The resolution instructs the Komsomol Central Committee and the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee, jointly with party, soviet, and economic organs, to carry out work to ensure the extensive enlistment of young people in the main sectors of the agro-industrial complex and to take proper care to ensure the necessary production, housing, cultural, and living conditions for them. Special attention must be paid to the formation of stable labor collectives at economically weak kolkhozes and sovkhozes in the RSFSR Non-Chernozem Zone, Siberia, and the Far East. Groups of young people made up of specialists in agriculture, public education, culture, medical, trade, and consumer services and the mass professions are to be sent to these farms.

The Komsomol Central Committee, the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee, and the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate are instructed to carry out the necessary explanatory work among servicemen who are being released into the reserve. Those who express a desire to work in agriculture should be dispatched to kolkhozes, sovkhozes, or other enterprises.

Media Report 27-28 Sep Developments

LD290113 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian, unless otherwise indicated, on 27-28 September. GMT times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

27 September

Farmers in Issyk-Kul Oblast [in Kirghizia] have met their increased socialist obligations for grain sales to the state. The average grain yield was 41 quintals per hectare for wheat and barley. Some 300,000 metric tons of grain have already been sent to procurement points. Farmers have decided to raise their plan target by a further 4,000 metric tons of grain. (0900)

The harvesting of cereals is in the final crucial stage in the central and eastern parts of this country. A good harvest has been reported; however, the protracted rainy autumn has slowed down the harvesting. Harvesters, tractors, and motor vehicles have not been used for some time because of the continual rain. Cereals are still to be harvested on millions of hectares of land. Emergency measures are being adopted. On Saturday, farmers worked in the areas on a voluntary basis. Hundreds of thousands of city dwellers have gone to the areas to help save the harvest. (Moscow World Service in English, 1200)

28 September

In Moldavia the agricultural news is not very encouraging. Early frost can catch vegetable crops which still have not been harvested from 50 percent of the area, even in the south in Kagulskiy Rayon. This morning rain and strong winds started, halting the harvesting. Up until today the weather has been fine but the farmers were too slow in gathering the harvest. (0430)

Buckwheat, millet, and rice are being cultivated on 1 million hectares in Kazakhstan. Three-quarters of the groats have been harvested as of today. (0700)

Today Altay is completing grain harvesting and threshing on the fourth million hectares. (0900)

The current harvest is proving complex for farmers. The capricious Siberian weather is having an effect. However, there has never yet been easy grain in the Altay and there probably never will be. Nonetheless, as of today, grain crops have been threshed on almost 4 million hectares, 93 percent of the area sown to grain. The state has received 2,760,000 metron tons—88 percent of the plan and 72 percent of all wheat is of the strong, hard, first class [klassniye], and valuable varieties. (0908)

Scientific

'Cosmos-1887' Scientific Satellite Launched

LD291727 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1645 GMT 29 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow, 29 Sep (TASS)—Another earth satellite, "Cosmos-1887," was launched in the Soviet Union today.

The satellite carries sets of special scientific research apparatus designed for continuing research into the effects of space flight on monkeys and other biological objects, as well as apparatus for radiation and physics research.

In the course of the flight, experiments will be carried out on adaptation to weightlessness and ensuring the radiation safety of space flights. Two experiments will be carried out at the proposal of the Moscow City Pioneers' Palace and school children.

A considerable volume of the research and the experiments is being carried out within the framework of the program of international cooperation in studying and using space for peaceful purposes. Taking part in them are scientists of the Hungarian People's Republic, the GDR, the Polish People's Republic, the Romanian Socialist Republic, the CSSR, the United States, France and also the European Space Agency.

The satellite has been placed in an orbit with the following parameters: Initial period of revolution, 90.5 mins; apogee, 406 km; perigee 224 km; orbital inclination, 62.8 degrees.

Besides scientific apparatus, the satellite carries a radio system for precisely measuring orbital elements and a radiotelemetry system for transmitting to Earth data on the condition of the biological objects and the operation of the instruments and scientific apparatus.

The apparatus aboard the satellite is working normally.

The coordinating and computing center is processing the incoming information.

Mir Complex Flight Continues 'Normally'

LD291206 Moscow TASS in English 1128 GMT 29 Sep 87

[Text] Moscow September 29 TASS—A TASS special correspondent reported from mission control center:

The commander of the space research complex Mir (Peace), Yuriy Romanenko, has been working in near-earth orbit for 235 days.

Flight engineer Aleksandr Aleksandrov is winding up his tenth week in space.

Since the linkup with the unmanned cargo ship Progress-32, the cosmonauts have been busy unloading the equipment brought by the craft and installing it inside the orbital complex.

Today's schedule provides for routine maintenance operations on board the station and a number of technical experiments.

The calibration and adjustment of equipment of the orbital observatory Roentgen continued within the framework of the international programme of astrophysical studies. The telescopes will again be aimed at the Crab Nebula.

According to reports by the crew and telemetry information, the flight of the manned complex Mir is proceeding normally.

BRIEFS

Leningrad-Antarctic Air Bridge

Leningrad, 29 September, (TASS)—A heavy turboprop IL-18 airliner took off today from Leningrad for the Arctic. Along an airbridge over 15,000 km long, with stopovers in Aden and Maputo, the airplane will take a group of scientists and specialists to the Molodezhnaya Observatory for the 33rd Soviet scientific expedition to the white continent. The airliner is expected to reach its destination on 1 October. It will then fly over the Antarctic during 1 and 1/2 months as a flying laboratory, based at the Molodezhnaya ice strip aerodrome and the Novolazarevskaya station. The airplane is equipped with apparatus for depth sounding of the ice sheet and for observing the atmosphere and geophysical poles.

The overflights will open a series of air transport operations in the handover of wintering crews at the Soviet observatories and stations and will fly in scientific teams for the winter. Over 300 polar workers will be transported, including researchers from socialist countries. [Text] *[Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1611 GMT 29 Sep 87 LD]*

Military

USSR 'Prepared To Publish' Defense Figures

PM301443 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 36, 6 Sep 87 p 3

[Viktor Tsoppi article under rubric "The World on My Personal Computer": "A Direct and Functional Connection"]

[Text] President Reagan, speaking in Los Angeles on August 26, called the words uttered by Winston Churchill in February 1945—"I don't think that the suffering of the world was ever greater, and everywhere as it is now."

That same day, on August 26, 1987, delegates from 140 countries at the International Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development were listening in New York at the UN HQ to the message sent by Mikhail Gorbachev in which a new model for humanity's development was formulated—from a suffering to worthy and materially comfortable life, from grief to hope. The US delegate was absent because the USA boycotted the conference. The U.S. State Department declared "that disarmament and development are questions between which there is no direct or functional connection".

Such is the frankest possible stand taken by the most armed and most industrialized imperialist state, which never tires of assuring the world of its indestructible aspiration for philanthropy, of its compassion with those who are miserable on earth. And it acts accordingly. It disarms, by taking out of its own arsenals the missiles which are then used to shoot down Afghan planes. It disarms, spending hundreds of millions of dollars to arm the contras who are wiping out Nicaraguan villages. It disarms by arming counter-revolutionaries in Angola and Mozambique. Therefore, the problem of these countries' development is being solved in a radical way.

Today there is talk about solving not only local and regional problems but also the problems of global development-the USA intends to disarm by jettisoning the latest and the best weapons into outer space, so as to rule the entire world development from there.

The USSR tabled for discussion of the conference a comprehensive plan, dictated by our choice in favor of disarmament, development, and a non-nuclear, non-violent world. We insist on the need to start at once the transfer of resources spent on the preparation of war to development. We are prepared, after saving means on curbing of our own arms production, to give a part of these means to the developing countries, even though the money would be very useful for our own development. We propose to set up the International Disarmament Fund. We are prepared to publish, for the sake of strengthening mutual confidence, not only the budget figures, directly connected with expenditures by the USSR Defense Ministry, but also those that are connected with the financing of the R. and D. work and with the purchase of arms and military hardware. We propose to start at once the elaboration of a new economic model of the world in conditions of disarmament, including the planning of conversion, i.e. of restructuring the arms industry to peace-time production.

Everything in our position is concrete, objective, visible and feasible. Instead of a competition in the race of nuclear tools of murder we propose cooperation in peaceful uses of atomic energy. Instead of Star Wars we want a peaceful space for all. Instead of chemical arms we want chemistry for the benefit of people. Instead of the deaf partitions of secrecy we want an open and public exchange of research results. We are of the opinion, that the developing countries should be rid of the heavy burden of arms, which we also deliver to them.

That is how—let us use the State Department phraseology—the direct and functional connection is expressed between our internal reconstruction and our revolutionary approach to key international problems. This is our

direct duty. This is our historical function. In this way we are proving again that as we understand it—the problems common for all humanity prevail over class problems. This can hardly be said about the frankly egoistic class stand taken by the rulers of the USA, who are even afraid of discussing the subject.